09-32799

THE

CAMPAIGN OF 1860,

COMPRISING THE

SPEECHES

OF

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
HENRY WILSON, BENJAMIN F. WADE,
CARL SCHURZ, CHARLES SUMNER,
WILLIAM M. EVARTS, &c.

ALBANY:
WEED, PARSONS & COMPANY.
1860.

JK2357
1860a

Gift
A. R. Spofford estate
120 '08

28997 X

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS.---No. 1.

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT.

A SPEECH

BY

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

DELIVERED AT ROCHESTER, MONDAY, OCT. 25, 1858.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: The unmistakable outbreaks of zeal which occur all around me, show that you are earnest men—and such a man am I. Let us therefore, at least for a time, pass by all secondary and collateral questions, whether of a personal or of a general nature, and consider the main subject of the present canvass. The Democratic party—or, to speak more accurately—the party which wears that attractive name, is in possession of the Federal Government. The Republicans propose to dislodge that party, and dismiss it from its high trust.

The main subject, then, is, whether the Democratic party deserves to retain the confidence of the American People. In attempting to prove it unworthy, I think that I am not actuated by prejudices against that party, or by prepossessions in favor of its adversary; for I have learned, by some experience, that virtue and patriotism, vice and selfishness, are found in all parties, and that they differ less in their motives than in the policies they pursue.

Our country is a theatre, which exhibits, in full operation, two radically different political systems; the one resting on the basis of servile or slave labor, the other on the basis of voluntary labor of freemen.

The laborers who are enslaved are all negroes, or persons more or less purely of African derivation. But this is only accidental. The principle of the system is, that labor in every society, by whomsoever performed, is necessarily unintellectual, grovelling and base; and that the laborer, equally for his own good and for the welfare of the State, ought to be enslaved. The white laboring man, whether native or foreigner, is not enslaved, only because he cannot, as yet, be reduced to bondage.

You need not be told now that the slave system is the older of the two, and that once it was universal.

The emancipation of our own ancestors, Caucasians and Europeans as they were, hardly dates beyond a period of five hundred years. The great melioration of human society which modern times exhibit, is mainly due to the incomplete substitution of the system of voluntary labor for the old one of servile labor, which has already taken place. This African slave system is one which, in its origin and in its growth, has been altogether foreign from the habits of the races which colonized these States, and established civilization here. It was introduced on this new continent as an engine of conquest, and for the establishment of monarchial power, by the Portuguese and the Spaniards, and was rapidly extended by them all over South America, Central America, Louisiana, and Mexico. Its legitimate fruits are seen in the poverty, imbecility, and anarchy, which now pervade all Portuguese and Spanish America. The free-labor system is of German extraction, and it was established in our country by emigrants from Sweden, Holland, Germany, Great Britain, and Ireland.

We justly ascribe to its influences the strength, wealth, greatness, intelligence, and freedom, which the whole American people now enjoy. One of the chief elements of the value of human life is freedom in the pursuit of happiness. The slave system is not only intolerable, unjust, and inhuman, towards the laborer, whom, only because he is a laborer, it loads down with chains and converts into merchandise, but is scarcely less severe upon the freeman, to whom, only because he is a laborer from necessity, it denies facilities for employment, and whom it expels from the community because it cannot

☞ FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF THE ALBANY EVENING JOURNAL. PRICE, PER SINGLE COPY, 2c.; DOZEN COPIES, 20c.; PER HUNDRED, $1; PER THOUSAND, $8.

enslave and convert him into merchandise also. It is necessarily improvident and ruinous, because, as a general truth, communities prosper and flourish or droop and decline in just the degree that they practise or neglect to practise the primary duties of justice and humanity. The free-labor system conforms to the divine law of equality, which is written in the hearts and consciences of men, and therefore is always and everywhere beneficent.

The slave system is one of constant danger, distrust, suspicion, and watchfulness. It debases those whose toil alone can produce wealth and resources for defence, to the lowest degree of which human nature is capable, to guard against mutiny and insurrection, and thus wastes energies which otherwise might be employed in national development and aggrandizement.

The free-labor system educates all alike, and by opening all the fields of industrial employment, and all the departments of authority, to the unchecked and equal rivalry of all classes of men, at once secures universal contentment, and brings into the highest possible activity all the physical, moral, and social energies of the whole State. In States where the slave-system prevails, the masters, directly or indirectly, secure all political power, and constitute a ruling aristocracy. In States where the free-labor system prevails, universal suffrage necessarily obtains, and the State inevitably becomes, sooner or later, a republic or democracy.

Russia yet maintains slavery, and is a despotism. Most of the other European States have abolished slavery, and adopted the system of free-labor. It was the antagonistic political tendencies of the two systems which the first Napoleon was contemplating when he predicted that Europe would ultimately be either all Cossack or all Republican. Never did human sagacity utter a more pregnant truth. The two systems are at once perceived to be incongruous. But they are more than incongruous —they are incompatible. They never have permanently existed together in one country, and they never can. It would be easy to demonstrate this impossibility, from the irreconcilable contrast between their great principles and characteristics. But the experience of mankind has conclusively established it. Slavery, as I have already intimated, existed in every State in Europe. Free labor has supplanted it everywhere except in Russia and Turkey. State necessities developed in modern times, are now obliging even those two nations to encourage and employ free labor; and already, despotic as they are, we find them engaged inabolishing slavery. In the United States, slavery came into collision with free labor at the close of the last century, and fell before it in New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, but triumphed over it effectually, and excluded it for a period yet undetermined, from Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia. Indeed, so incompatible are the two systems, that every new State which is organized within our ever-extending domain makes its first political act a choice of the one and an exclusion of the other, even at the cost of civil war, if necessary. The slave States, without law, at the last national election, successfully forbade, within their own limits, even the casting of votes for a candidate for President of the United States supposed to be favorable to the establishment of the free-labor system in new States.

Hitherto, the two systems have existed in different States, but side by side within the American Union. This has happened because the Union is a confederation of States. But in another aspect the United States constitute only one nation. Increase of population, which is filling the States out to their very borders, together with a new and extended net-work of railroads and other avenues, and an internal commerce which daily becomes more intimate, is rapidly bringing the States into a higher and more perfect social unity or consolidation. Thus, these antagonistic systems are continually coming into closer contact, and collision results.

Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think that it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested or fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slave-holding nation, or entirely a free-labor nation. Either the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina and the sugar plantations of Louisiana will ultimately be tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rye-fields and wheat-fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is the failure to apprehend this great truth that induces so many unsuccessful attempts at final compromise between the slave and free States, and it is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromises, when made, vain and ephemeral. Startling as this saying may appear to you, fellow-citizens, it is by no means an original or even a moderate one. Our forefathers knew it to be true, and unanimously acted upon it when they framed the Constitution of the United States. They regarded the existence of the servile system in so many of the States with sorrow and shame, which they openly confessed, and they looked upon the collision between them, which was then just revealing itself, and which we are now accustomed to deplore, with favor and hope. They knew that either the one or the other system must exclusively prevail.

Unlike too many of those who in modern time invoke their authority, they had a choice between the two. They preferred the system of free labor, and they determined to organize

the Government, and so to direct its activity, that that system should surely and certainly prevail. For this purpose, and no other, they based the whole structure of Government broadly on the principle that all men are created equal, and therefore free—little dreaming that, within the short period of one hundred years, their descendants would bear to be told by any orator, however popular, that the utterance of that principle was merely a rhetorical rhapsody; or by any judge, however venerated, that it was attended by mental reservations, which rendered it hypocritical and false. By the Ordinance of 1787, they dedicated all of the national domain not yet polluted by Slavery to free labor immediately, thenceforth and forever; while by the new Constitution and laws they invited foreign free labor from all lands under the sun, and interdicted the importation of African slave labor, at all times, in all places, and under all circumstances whatsoever. It is true that they necessarily and wisely modified this policy of Freedom, by leaving it to the several States, affected as they were by differing circumstances, to abolish slavery in their own way and at their own pleasure, instead of confiding that duty to Congress, and that they secured to the Slave States, while yet retaining the system of Slavery, a three-fifths representation of slaves in the Federal Government, until they should find themselves able to relinquish it with safety. But the very nature of these modifications fortifies my position that the fathers knew that the two systems could not endure within the Union, and expected that within a short period Slavery would disappear forever. Moreover, in order that these modifications might not altogether defeat their grand design of a Republic maintaining universal equality, they provided that two-thirds of the States might amend the Constitution.

It remains to say on this point only one word, to guard against misapprehension. If these States are to again become universally slave-holding, I do not pretend to say with what violations of the Constitution that end shall be accomplished. On the other hand, while I do confidently believe and hope that my country will yet become a land of universal Freedom, I do not expect that it will be made so otherwise than through the action of the several States co-operating with the Federal Government, and all acting in strict conformity with their respective Constitutions.

The strife and contentions concerning Slavery, which gently-disposed persons so habitually deprecate, are nothing more than the ripening of the conflict which the fathers themselves not only thus regarded with favor, but which they may be said to have instituted.

It is not to be denied, however, that thus far the course of that contest has not been according to their humane anticipations and wishes. In the field of federal politics, Slavery, deriving unlooked-for advantages from commercial changes, and energies unforeseen from the facilities of combination between members of the slaveholding class and between that class and other property classes, early rallied, and has at length made a stand, not merely to retain its original defensive position, but to extend its sway throughout the whole Union. It is certain that the slaveholding class of American citizens indulge this high ambition, and that they derive encouragement for it from the rapid and effective political successes which they have already obtained. The plan of operation is this: By continued appliances of patronage and threats of disunion, they will keep a majority favorable to these designs in the Senate, where each State has an equal representation. Through that majority they will defeat, as they best can, the admission of free States and secure the admission of slave States. Under the protection of the Judiciary, they will, on the principle of the Dred Scott case, carry Slavery into all the Territories of the United States now existing and hereafter to be organized. By the action of the President and the Senate, using the treaty-making power, they will annex foreign slaveholding States. In a favorable conjuncture they will induce Congress to repeal the act of 1808, which prohibits the foreign slave-trade, and so they will import from Africa, at the cost of only $20 a head, slaves enough to fill up the interior of the continent. Thus relatively increasing the number of slave States, they will allow no amendment to the Constitution prejudicial to their interest; and so, having permanently established their power, they expect the Federal Judiciary to nullify all State laws which shall interfere with internal or foreign commerce in slaves. When the free States shall be sufficiently demoralized to tolerate these designs, they reasonable conclude that Slavery will be accepted by those States themselves. I shall not stop to show how speedy or how complete would be the ruin which the accomplishment of these slaveholding schemes would bring upon the country. For one, I should not remain in the country to test the sad experiment. Having spent my manhood, though not my whole life, in a free State, no aristocracy of any kind, much less an aristocracy of slaveholders, shall ever make the laws of the land in which I shall be content to live. Having seen the society around me universally engaged in agriculture, manufactures and trade, which were innocent and beneficent, I shall never be a denizen of a State where men and women are reared as cattle, and bought and sold as merchandise. When that evil day shall come, and all further effort at resistance shall be impossible, then, if there shall be no better hope for redemption than I can now foresee, I shall say with Franklin, while looking abroad over the whole earth for a new and more congenial home, "Where liberty dwells, there is my country."

You will tell me that these fears are extravagant and chimerical. I answer, they are so; but they are so only because the designs of the slaveholders must and can be defeated. But it is only the possibility of defeat that renders them so. They cannot be defeated by inactivity. There is no escape from them, compatible with non-resistance. How, then, and in what way, shall the necessary resistance be made? There is only one way. The Democratic party must be permanently dislodged from the Government. The reason is, that the Democratic party is inextricably committed to the designs of the slaveholders, which I have described. Let me be well understood. I do not charge that the Democratic candidates for public office now before the people are pledged to, much less that the Democratic masses who support them really adopt, those atrocious and dangerous designs. Candidates may, and generally do, mean to act justly, wisely, and patriotically, when they shall be elected; but they become the ministers and servants, not the dictators, of the power which elects them. The policy which a party shall pursue at a future period is only gradually developed, depending on the occurrence of events never fully foreknown. The motives of men, whether acting as electors or in any other capacity, are generally pure. Nevertheless, it is not more true that "Hell is paved with good intentions," than it is that earth is covered with wrecks resulting from innocent and amiable motives.

The very constitution of the Democratic party commits it to execute all the designs of the slaveholders, whatever they may be. It is not a party of the whole Union, of all the free States and of all the slave States; nor yet is it a party of the free States in the North and in the Northwest; but it is a sectional and local party, having practically its seat within the slave States, and counting its constituency chiefly and almost exclusively there. Of all its representatives in Congress and in the Electoral Colleges, two-thirds uniformly come from these States. Its great element of strength lies in the vote of the slaveholders, augmented by the representation of three-fifths of the slaves. Deprive the Democratic party of this strength, and it would be a helpless and hopeless minority, incapable of continued organization. The Democratic party, being thus local and sectional, acquires new strength from the admission of every new slave State, and loses relatively by the admission of every new free State into the Union.

A party is in one sense a joint-stock association, in which those who contribute most direct the action and management of the concern. The slaveholders contributing in an overwhelming proportion to the capital strength of the Democratic party, they necessarily dictate and prescribe its policy. The inevitable caucus system enables them to do so with a show of fairness and justice. If it were possible to conceive for a moment that the Democratic party should disobey the behests of the slaveholders, we should then see a withdrawal of the slaveholders, which would leave the party to perish. The portion of the party which is found in the free States is a mere appendage, convenient to modify its sectional character, without impairing its sectional constitution, and is less effective in regulating its movement than the nebulous tail of the comet is in determining the appointed though apparently eccentric course of the fiery sphere from which it emanates.

To expect the Democratic party to resist Slavery and favor Freedom, is as unreasonable as to look for Protestant missionaries to the Catholic Propaganda of Rome. The history of the Democratic party commits it to the policy of Slavery. It has been the Democratic party, and no other agency, which has carried that policy up to its present alarming culmination. Without stopping to ascertain, critically, the origin of the present Democratic party, we may concede its claim to date from the era of good feeling which occurred under the Administration of President Monroe. At that time, in this State, and about that time in many others of the free States, the Democratic party deliberately disfranchised the free colored or African citizen, and it has pertinaciously continued this disfranchisement ever since. This was an effective aid to Slavery; for while the slaveholder votes for his slaves against Freedom, the freed slave in the free States is prohibited from voting against Slavery.

In 1824, the Democracy resisted the election of John Quincy Adams—himself before that time an acceptable Democrat—and in 1828, it expelled him from the Presidency and put a slaveholder in his place, although the office had been filled by slaveholders thirty-two out of forty years.

In 1836, Martin Van Buren—the first non-slaveholding citizen of a free State to whose election the Democratic party ever consented—signalized his inauguration into the Presidency by a gratuitous announcement, that under no circumstances would he ever approve a bill for the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia. From 1838 to 1844, the subject of abolishing Slavery in the District of Columbia and in the national dock-yards and arsenals was brought before Congress by repeated popular appeals. The Democratic party thereupon promptly denied the right of petition, and effectually suppressed the freedom of speech in Congress, so far as the institution of Slavery was concerned.

From 1840 to 1843, good and wise men counselled that Texas should remain outside of the Union until she should consent to relinquish her self-instituted Slavery; but the Democratic party precipitated her admission into the Union, not only without that condition, but even with a covenant that the State might be divided and reorganized so as to constitute four slave States instead of one.

In 1846, when the United States became in-

volved in a war with Mexico, and it was apparent that the struggle would end in the dismemberment of that republic, which was a non-slaveholding power, the Democratic party rejected a declaration that Slavery should not be established within the territory to be acquired. When, in 1850, governments were to be instituted in the Territories of California and New Mexico, the fruits of that war, the Democratic party refused to admit New Mexico as a free State, and only consented to admit California as a free State on the condition, as it has since explained the transaction, of leaving all of New Mexico and Utah open to Slavery, to which was also added the concession of perpetual Slavery in the District of Columbia, and the passage of an unconstitutional, cruel, and humiliating law, for the recapture of fugitive slaves, with a further stipulation that the subject of Slavery should never again be agitated in either chamber of Congress. When, in 1854, the slaveholders were contentedly reposing on these great advantages, then so recently won, the Democratic party unnecessarily, officiously, and with superserviceable liberality, awakened them from their slumber, to offer and force on their acceptance the abrogation of the law which declared that neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude should ever exist within that part of the ancient territory of Louisiana which lay outside of the State of Missouri, and north of the parallel of 36 deg. 30 m. of north latitude—a law which, with the exception of one other, was the only statute of Freedom then remaining in the Federal code.

In 1856, when the people of Kansas had organized a new State within the region thus abandoned to Slavery, and applied to be admitted as a free State into the Union, the Democratic party contemptuously rejected their petition, and drove them with menaces and intimidations, from the Halls of Congress, and armed the President with military power to enforce their submission to a slave code, established over them by fraud and usurpation. At every subsequent stage of the long contest which has since raged in Kansas, the Democratic party has lent its sympathies, its aid, and all the powers of the Government which it controlled, to enforce Slavery upon that unwilling and injured people. And now, even at this day, while it mocks us with the assurance that Kansas is free, the Democratic party keeps the State excluded from her just and proper place in the Union, under the hope that she may be dragooned into the acceptance of Slavery.

The Democratic party, finally, has procured from a Supreme Judiciary, fixed in its interest, a decree that Slavery exists by force of the Constitution in every Territory of the United States, paramount to all legislative authority, either within the Territory, or residing in Congress.

Such is the Democratic party. It has no policy, State or Federal, for finance, or trade, or manufacture, or commerce, or education, or internal improvements, or for the protection or even the security of civil or religious liberty. It is positive and uncompromising in the interest of Slavery—negative, compromising, and vacillating, in regard to everything else. It boasts its love of equality, and wastes its strength, and even its life, in fortifying the only aristocracy known in the land. It professes fraternity, and, so often as Slavery requires, allies itself with proscription. It magnifies itself for conquests in foreign lands, but it sends the national eagle forth always with chains, and not the olive branch, in his fangs.

This dark record shows you, fellow-citizens, what I was unwilling to announce at an earlier stage of this argument, that of the whole nefarious schedule of slaveholding designs which I have submitted to you, the Democratic party has left only one yet to be consummated—the abrogation of the law which forbids the African slave trade.

Now, I know very well that the Democratic party has, at every stage of these proceedings, disavowed the motive and the policy of fortifying and extending Slavery, and has excused them on entirely different and more plausible grounds. But the inconsistency and frivolity of these pleas prove still more conclusively the guilt I charge upon that party. It must, indeed, try to excuse such guilt before mankind, and even to the consciences of its own adherents. There is an instinctive abhorrence of Slavery, and an inborn and inhering love of Freedom in the human heart, which render palliation of such gross misconduct indispensable. It disfranchised the free African on the ground of a fear that, if left to enjoy the right of suffrage, he might seduce the free white citizen into amalgamation with his wronged and despised race. The Democratic party condemned and deposed John Quincy Adams, because he expended $12,000,000 a year, while it justifies his favored successor in spending $70,000,000, $80,000,000, and even $100,000,000, a year. It denies emancipation in the District of Columbia, even with compensation to masters and the consent of the people, on the ground of an implied constitutional inhibition, although the Constitution expressly confers upon Congress sovereign legislative power in that District, and although the Democratic party is tenacious of the principle of strict construction. It violated the express provisions of the Constitution in suppressing petition and debate on the subject of Slavery, through fear of disturbance of the public harmony, although it claims that the electors have a right to instruct their representatives, and even demand their resignation in cases of contumacy. It extended Slavery over Texas, and connived at the attempt to spread it across the Mexican territories, even to the shores of the Pacific Ocean, under a plea of enlarging the area of Freedom. It abrogated the Mexican slave law and the Missouri Compromise prohibition of Slavery in Kansas, not to open the new Territories to Slavery, but to try therein the new and fascinating theories of Non-intervention

and Popular Sovereignty; and, finally, it overthrew both these new and elegant systems by the English Lecompton bill and the Dred Scott decision, on the ground that the free States ought not to enter the Union without a population equal to the representative basis of one member of Congress, although slave States might come in without inspection as to their numbers.

Will any member of the Democratic party now here claim that the authorities chosen by the suffrages of the party transcended their partisan platforms, and so misrepresented the party in the various transactions I have recited? Then I ask him to name one Democratic statesman or legislator, from Van Buren to Walker, who either timidly or cautiously like them, or boldly and defiantly like Douglas, ever refused to execute a behest of the slaveholders and was not therefor, and for no other cause, immediately denounced, and deposed from his trust, and repudiated by the Democratic party for that contumacy.

I think, fellow-citizens, that I have shown you that it is high time for the friends of Freedom to rush to the rescue of the Constitution, and that their very first duty is to dismiss the Democratic party from the administration of the Government.

Why shall it not be done? All agree that it ought to be done. What, then, shall prevent its being done? Nothing but timidity or division of the opponents of the Democratic party.

Some of these opponents start one objection, and some another. Let us notice these objections briefly. One class say that they cannot trust the Republican party; that it has not avowed its hostility to Slavery boldly enough, or its affection for Freedom earnestly enough.

I ask, in reply, is there any other party which can be more safely trusted? Every one knows that it is the Republican party, or none, that shall displace the Democratic party. But I answer, further, that the character and fidelity of any party are determined, necessarily, not by its pledges, programmes, and platforms, but by the public exigencies, and the temper of the people when they call it into activity. Subserviency to Slavery is a law written not only on the forehead of the Democratic party, but also in its very soul—so resistance to Slavery, and devotion to Freedom, the popular elements now actively working for the Republican party among the people, must and will be the resources for its ever-renewing strength and constant invigoration.

Others cannot support the Republican party, because it has not sufficiently exposed its platform, and determined what it will do, and what it will not do, when triumphant. It may prove too progressive for some, and too conservative for others. As if any party ever foresaw so clearly the course of future events as to plan a universal scheme for future action, adapted to all possible emergencies. Who would ever have joined even the Whig party of the Revolution, if it had been obliged to answer, in 1775, whether it would declare for Independence in 1776, and for this noble Federal Constitution of ours in 1787, and not a year earlier or later?

The people of the United States will be as wise next year, and the year afterward, and even ten years hence, as we are now. They will oblige the Republican party to act as the public welfare and the interests of justice and humanity shall require, through all the stages of its career, whether of trial or triumph.

Others will not venture an effort, because they fear that the Union would not endure the change. Will such objectors tell me how long a Constitution can bear a strain directly along the fibres of which it is composed? This is a Constitution of Freedom. It is being converted into a Constitution of Slavery. It is a republican Constitution. It is being made an aristocratic one. Others wish to wait until some collateral questions concerning temperance, or the exercise of the elective franchise are properly settled. Let me ask all such persons, whether time enough has not been wasted on these points already, without gaining any other than this single advantage, namely, the discovery that only one thing can be effectually done at one time, and that the one thing which must and will be done at any one time is just that thing which is most urgent, and will no longer admit of postponement or delay. Finally, we are told by faint-hearted men that they despond; the Democratic party, they say, is unconquerable, and the dominion of Slavery is consequently inevitable. I reply to them, that the complete and universal dominion of Slavery would be intolerable enough when it should have come after the last possible effort to escape should have been made. There would, in that case, be left to us the consoling reflection of fidelity to duty.

But I reply further, that I know—few, I think, know better than I—the resources and energies of the Democratic party, which is identical with the Slave Power. I do ample prestige to its traditional popularity. I know, further—few, I think, know better than I—the difficulties and disadvantages of organizing a new political force, like the Republican party, and the obstacles it must encounter in laboring without prestige and without patronage. But, understanding all this, I know that the Democratic party must go down, and that the Republican party must rise into its place. The Democratic party derived its strength, originally, from its adoption of the principles of equal and exact justice to all men. So long as it practised this principle faithfully, it was invulnerable. It became vulnerable when it renounced the principle, and since that time it has maintained itself, not by virtue of its own strength, or even of its traditional merits, but because there as yet had appeared in the political field no other party that had the conscience

and the courage to take up, and avow, and practise the life-inspiring principle which the Democratic party had surrendered. At last, the Republican party has appeared. It avows, now, as the Republican party of 1800 did, in one word, its faith and its works, "Equal and exact justice to all men." Even when it first entered the field, only half organized, it struck a blow which only just failed to secure complete and triumphant victory. In this, its second campaign, it has already won advantages which render that triumph now both easy and certain.

The secret of its assured success lies in that very characteristic which, in the mouth of scoffers, constitutes its great and lasting imbecility and reproach. It lies in the fact that it is a party of one idea; but that idea is a noble one —an idea that fills and expands all generous souls; the idea of equality—the equality of all men before human tribunals and human laws, as they all are equal before the Divine tribunal and Divine laws.

I know, and you know, that a revolution has begun. I know, and all the world knows, that revolutions never go backward. Twenty Senators and a hundred Representatives proclaim boldly in Congress to-day sentiments and opinions and principles of Freedom which hardly so many men, even in this free State, dared to utter in their own homes twenty years ago. While the Government of the United States, under the conduct of the Democratic party, has been all that time surrendering one plain and castle after another to Slavery, the people of the United States have been no less steadily and perseveringly gathering together the forces with which to recover back again all the fields and all the castles which have been lost, and to confound and overthrow, by one decisive blow, the betrayers of the Constitution and Freedom forever.

"NEGRO SLAVERY NOT UNJUST."

A SPEECH

BY

CHARLES O'CONOR,

AT THE UNION MEETING,

At the Academy of Music, New York City, December 19, 1859.

Mr. Mayor and Gentlemen:—I cannot express to you the delight which I experience in beholding in this great city so vast an assembly of my fellow-citizens, convened for the purpose stated in your resolutions. I am delighted beyond measure to behold at this time so vast an assembly responding to the call of a body so respectable as the twenty thousand New Yorkers who have convened this meeting. If anything can give assurance to those who doubt, and confidence to those who may have had misgivings as to the permanency of our institutions, and the solidity of the support which the people of the North are prepared to give them, it is that in the queen city of the New World, in the capital of North America, there is assembled a meeting so large, so respectable, and so unanimous as this meeting has shown itself to be in receiving sentiments which, if observed, must protect our Union from destruction, and even from danger. (Applause.) Gentlemen, is it not a subject of astonishment that the idea of danger, and the still more dreadful idea of dissolution, should be heard from the lips of an American citizen, at this day, in reference to, or in connection with, the sacred name of this most sacred Union? (Applause.) Why gentlemen, what is our Union? What are its antecedents? What is its present condition? If we ward off the evils which threaten it, what its future hope for us and for the great family of mankind? Why, gentlemen, it may well be said of this Union as a government, that as it is the last offspring, so is it Time's most glorious and beneficent production. Gentlemen, we are created by an Omniscient Being. We are created by a Being not only All-Seeing, but All-Powerful and All-Wise. And in the benignity and the farseeing wisdom of His power, He permitted the great family of mankind to live on, to advance, to improve, step by step, and yet permitted five thousand years and upward to elapse ere He laid the foundation of a truly free, a truly happy, and a truly independent empire. It

was not gentlemen, until that great length of time had elapsed, that the earth was deemed mature for laying the foundations of this mighty and prosperous State. It was then that He inspired the noble-minded and chivalrous Genoese to set forth upon the trackless ocean and discover the empire that we now enjoy. But a few years, comparatively, had elapsed when there was raised up in this blessed land a set of men whose like had never before existed upon the face of this earth. Men unequaled in their perceptions of the true principles of justice, in their comprehensive benevolence, in their capacity to lay safely, justly, soundly, and with all the qualities which should insure permanency, the foundations of an empire. It was in 1776, and in this country, that there assembled the first, the very first, assembly of rational men who ever proclaimed, in clear and undeniable form, the immutable principles of liberty, and consecrated, to all time I trust, in the face of tyrants, and in opposition to their power, the rights of nations and the rights of men. (Applause.) These patriots, as soon as the storm of war had passed away, sat down and framed that instrument upon which our Union rests, the Constitution of the United States of America. (Applause.) And the question now before us is neither more nor less than this: whether that Constitution, consecrated by the blood shed in that glorious Revolution, consecrated by the signature of the most illustrious man who ever lived, George Washington (applause) — whether that instrument, accepted by the wisest and by the best of that day, and accepted in convention, one by one, in each and every State of this Union—that instrument from which so many blessings have flown—whether that instrument was conceived in crime, is a chapter of abominations (cries of "No, no"), is a violation of justice, is a league between strong-handed but wicked-hearted white men to oppress, and improverish, and plunder their fellow-creatures, contrary to rectitude, honor and justice. (Applause.) This is the question, neither more nor less. We are told from pulpits, we are told from the political rostrum, we are told in the legislative assemblies of our Northern States, not merely by speakers, but by distinct resolutions of the whole body—we are told by gentlemen occupying seats in the Congress of the Union through the votes of Northern people—that the Constitution seeks to enshrine, to protect, to defend a monstrous crime against justice and humanity, and that it is our duty to defeat its provisions, to outwit them, if we cannot otherwise get rid of their effect, and to trample upon the rights which it has declared shall be protected and insured to our brethren of the South. (Applause.) That is the doctrine now advocated. And I ask whether that doctrine, necessarily involving the destruction of our Union, shall be permitted to prevail as it has hitherto prevailed? Gentlemen, I trust you will excuse me for deliberately coming up to and meeting this question—not seeking to captivate your fancies by a trick of words—not seeking to exalt your imaginations by declamation or by any effort at eloquence, —but meeting this question gravely, sedately, and soberly, and asking you what is to be our course in relation to it? Gentlemen, the Constitution guarantees to the people of the Southern States the protection of their slave property. In that respect it is a solemn compact between the North and the South. As a solemn compact, are we at liberty to violate it? (Cries of "No, no!") Are we at liberty to seek or take any mean, petty advantage of it? (Cries of "No, no!") Are we at liberty to con over its particular words, and to restrict and to limit its operation, so as to acquire under such narrow construction, a pretence of right by hostile and adverse legislation? ("No! no!")—to interfere with the interests, wound the feelings, and trample on the political rights of our Southern fellow-citizens? (No! no! no!") No, gentlemen. If it be a compact, and has anything sacred in it, we are bound to observe it in good faith, honestly and honorably, not merely to the letter, but fully to the spirit, and not in any mincing, half-way, unfair, or illiberal construction, seeking to satisfy the letter, to give as little as we can, and thereby to defeat the spirit. (Applause.) That may be the way that some men keep a contract about the sale of a house or of a chattel, but it is not the way honest men observe contracts, even in relation to the most trivial things. ("True," and applause.) What has been done, having a tendency to disturb harmony under this Constitution, and to break down and destroy the union now existing between these States? Why, gentlemen, at an early period the subject of slavery, as a mere philosophical question, was discussed by many, and its justice or injustice made the subject of argument leading to various opinions. It mattered little how long this discussion should last, while it was confined within such limits. If it had only led to the formation of societies like the Shakers, who do not believe in matrimony; societies like the people of Utah, destined to a short career, who believe in too much of it (laughter); or societies of people like the strong-minded women of our country, who believe that women are much better qualified than men to perform the functions and offices usually performed by men (laughter)—and who probably would, if they had their way, simply change the order of proceedings, and transfer the husband to the kitchen, and themselves to the field or the cabinet. (Laughter and applause.) So long, I say, as this sentimentality touching slavery confined itself to the formation of parties and societies of this description, it certainly could do no great harm, and we might satisfy ourselves with the maxim that "Error can do little harm as long as truth is left free to combat it." But unfortunately, gentlemen, this sentimentality has found its

way out of the meeting-houses—from among pious people, assemblies of speculative philosophers, and societies formed to benefit the inhabitants of Barioboola-gha—it has found its way into the heart of the selfish politician; it has been made the war-cry of party; it has been made the instrument whereby to elevate not merely to personal distinction and social rank, but to political power. Throughout the non-slaveholding States of this Union, men have been thus elevated who advocate a course of conduct necessarily exasperating the South, and the natural effect of whose teachings renders the Southern people insecure in their property and their lives, making it a matter of doubt each night whether they can safely retire to their slumbers without sentries and guards to protect them against incursions from the North. I say the effect has been to elevate, on the strength of this sentiment, such men to power. And what is the result—the condition of things at this day? Why, gentlemen, the occasion that calls us together is the occurrence of a raid upon the State of Virginia by a few misguided fanatics—followers of these doctrines, with arms in their hands, and bent on rapine and murder. I called them followers, but they should be deemed leaders. They were the best, the bravest, and the most virtuous of all the abolition party. (Applause.) On the Lord's day, at the hour of still repose, they armed the bondman with pikes brought from the North, that he might slay his master, his master's wife, and his master's little children. And immediately succeeding to it—at this very instant—what is the political question pending before Congress?

A book substantially encouraging the same course of provocation toward the South which has been long pursued, is openly recommended to circulation by sixty-eight members of your Congress. (Cries of "Shame on them," applause, and hisses.) Recommended to circulation by sixty-eight members of your Congress, all elected in Northern States (hisses and applause)—every one, I say, elected from non-slaveholding States. And with the assistance of their associates, some of whom hold their offices by your votes, there is great danger that they will elect to the highest office in that body, where he will sit as a representative of the whole North, a man who united in causing that book to be distributed through the South, carrying poison and death in its polluted leaves. ("Hang him," and applause.) Is it not fair to say that this great and glorious Union is menaced when such a state of things is found to exist? when such an act is attempted? Is it reasonable to expect that our brethren of the South will calmly sit down ("No.") and submit quietly to such an outrage? (Cries of "No, no.") Why, gentlemen, we greatly exceed them in numbers. The non-slaveholding States are by far the more populous; they are increasing daily in numbers and in population and we may soon overwhelm the Southern vote. If we continue to fill the halls of legislation with abolitionists, and permit to occupy the executive chair men who declare themselves to be enlisted in a crusade against slavery, and against the provisions of the Constitution which secure that species of property, what can we reasonably expect from the people of the South but that they will pronounce the Constitution—with all its glorious associations, with all its sacred memories—this Union, with its manifold present and promised blessings—an unendurable evil, threatening to crush and to destroy their most vital interests—to make their country a wilderness. Why should we expect them to submit to such a line of conduct on our part, and recognize us as brethren, or unite with us in perpetuating the Union?

For my part I do not see anything unjust or unreasonable in the declaration often made by Southern members on this subject. They tell us: "If you will thus assail us with incendiary pamphlets, if you will thus create a spirit in your country which leads to violence and bloodshed among us, if you will assail the institution upon which the prosperity of our country depends, and will elevate to office over us men who are pledged to aid in such transactions, and to oppress us by hostile legislation, we cannot—much as we revere the Constitution, greatly as we estimate the blessings which would flow from its faithful enforcement—we cannot longer depend on your compliance with its injunctions, or adhere to the Union." For my part, gentlemen, if the North continues to conduct itself in the selection of representatives to the Congress of the United States as, from, perhaps, a certain degree of negligence and inattention, it has heretofore conducted itself, the South is not to be censured if it withdraws from the Union. (Hisses and applause. A voice—"that's so." Three cheers for the Fugitive Slave Law.) We are not, gentlemen, to hold a meeting to say that "We love this Union; we delight in it; we are proud of it; it blesses us, and we enjoy it; but we shall fill all its offices with men of our own choosing, and, our brethren of the South, you shall enjoy its glorious past; you shall enjoy its mighty recollections; but it shall trample your institutions in the dust." We have no right to say it. We have no right to exact so much; and an opposite and entirely different course, fellow-citizens, must be ours—must be the course of the great North, if we would preserve this Union. (Applause, and cries of "Good.")

And, gentlemen, what is this glorious Union? What must we sacrifice if we exasperate our brethren of the South, and compel them, by injustice and breach of compact, to separate from us and to dissolve it? Why, gentlemen, the greatness and glory of the American name will then be a thing of yesterday. The glorious Revolution of the thirteen States will be a Revolution not achieved by us, but by a nation that has ceased to exist. The name of Washington will be, to us at

least at the North (cheers), but as the name of Julius Cæsar, or of some other great hero who has lived in times gone by, whose nation has perished and exists no more. The Declaration of Independence, what will that be? Why, the declaration of a State that no longer has place among the nations. All these bright and glorious recollections of the past must cease to be our property, and become mere memorials of a by-gone race and people. A line must divide the North from the South. What will be the consequences? Will this mighty city — growing as it now is, with wealth pouring into it from every portion of this mighty empire—will it continue to flourish as it has done? (Cries of "No, no!") Will your marble palaces that line Broadway, and raise their proud tops toward the sky, continue to increase, until, as is now promised under the Union, it shall present the most glorious picture of wealth, prosperity, and happiness, that the world has ever seen? (Applause.) No! gentlemen, no! such things cannot be. I do not say that we will starve, that we will perish, as a people, if we separate from the South. I admit, that if the line be drawn between us, they will have their measure of prosperity, and we will have ours; but meagre, small in the extreme, compared with what is existing, and promised under our Union, will be the prosperity of each.

Truly has it been said here to-night, that we were made for each other; separate us, and although you may not destroy us, you reduce each to so low a scale that well might humanity deplore the evil courses that brought about the result. True, gentlemen, we would have left, to boast of, our share of the glories of the Revolution. The Northern States sent forth to the conflict their bands of heroes, and shed their blood as freely as those of the South. But the dividing line would take away from us the grave of Washington. It is in his own beloved Virginia. (Applause and cheers.) It is in the State and near the spot where this treason that has been growing up in the North, so lately culminated in violence and bloodshed. We would lose the grave —we would lose all connection with the name of Washington. But our philanthropic and pious friends who would fain lead us to this result, would, of course, comfort us with the consoling reflection that we had the glorious memory of John Brown in its place. (Great laughter and cheers.) Are you, gentlemen, prepared to make the exchange? (Cries of "No, no.") Shall the tomb of Washington, that rises upon the bank of the Potomac, receiving its tribute from every nation of the earth—shall that become the property of a foreign State—a State hostile to us in its feelings, and we to it in ours? Shall we erect a monument among the arid hills at North Elba, and deem the privilege of making pilgrimages thither a recompense for the loss of every glorious recollection of the past, and for our severance from the name of Washington? He who is recognized as the Father of his Country? (Cries of "No, no," and cheers.) No, gentlemen, we are not prepared, I trust, for this sad exchange, this fatal severance. We are not prepared, I trust, either to part with our glorious past or to give up the advantages of our present happy condition. We are not prepared to relinquish our affection for the South, nor to involve our section in the losses, the deprivation of blessings and advantages necessarily resulting to each from disunion. Gentlemen, we never would have attained the wealth and prosperity as a nation which is now ours, but for our connection with these very much reviled and injured slaveholders of the Southern States. And, gentlemen, if dissolution is to take place, we must part with the trade of the South, and thereby surrender our participation in the wealth of the South. Nay, more—we are told from good authority, that we must not only part with the slave-holding States, but that our younger sister with the golden crown—rich, teeming California, she who added the final requisite to our greatness as a nation—will not come with us. She will remain with the South.

Gentlemen, if we allow this course of injustice toward the South to continue, these are to be the consequences—evil to us, evil also to them. Much of all that we are most proud of; much of all that contributes to our prosperity and greatness as a nation, must pass away from us.

The question is—Should we permit it to be continued, and submit to all these evils? Is there any reason to justify such a course? There is a reason preached to us for permitting it. We are told that slavery is unjust; we are told that it is a matter of conscience to put it down; and that whatever treaties or compacts, or laws, or constitutions, have been made to sanction and uphold it, it is still unholy, and that we are bound to trample upon treaties, compacts, laws and constitutions, and to stand by what these men arrogantly tell us is the law of God and a fundamental principle of natural justice. Indeed, gentlemen, these two things are not distinguishable. The law of God and natural justice, as between man and man, are one and the same. The wisest philosophers of ancient times —heathen philosophers—said, The rule of conduct between man and man is, to live honestly, to injure no man, and to render to every man his due. In words far more direct and emphatic, in words of the most perfect comprehensiveness, the Saviour of the world gave us the same rule in one short sentence—"Love thy neighbor as thyself." (Applause.) Now, speaking between us, people of the North and our brethren of the South, I ask you to act upon this maxim—the maxim of the heathen—the command of the living God: "Render to every man his due," "Love thy neighbor as thyself." (Applause.) Thus we should act and feel toward the South. Upon that maxim which came from Him of Nazareth we should act toward the South, but without putting upon it any new-fangled, modern interpretation. We

should neither say nor think that any Gospel minister of this day is wiser than God himself —than He who gave us the Gospel. These maxims should govern between us and our brethren of the South. But, gentlemen, the question is this: Do these maxims justify the assertion of those who seek to invade the rights of the South, by proclaiming negro slavery unjust? That is the point to which this great argument, involving the fate of our Union, must now come. Is negro slavery unjust? If it be unjust, it violates the first rule of human conduct, "Render to every man his due." If it be unjust, it violates the law of God which says, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," for that law requires that we should perpetrate no injustice. Gentlemen, if it could be maintained that negro slavery is unjust, is thus in conflict with the law of nature and the law of God, perhaps I might be prepared—perhaps we all ought to be prepared to go with that distinguished man to whom allusion is frequently made, and say, there is a "higher law" which compels us to trample beneath our feet, as a wicked and unholy compact, the Constitution established by our fathers, with all the blessings it secures to their children. But I insist—and that is the argument which we must meet, and on which we must come to a conclusion that shall govern our action in the future selection of representatives in the Congress of the United States—*I insist that negro slavery is not unjust.* (Long continued applause.) *It is not unjust; it is just, wise and beneficent.* (Hisses, followed by applause, and cries of "put him out.") Let him stay, gentlemen.

PRESIDENT—Let him stay there. Order.

Mr. O'CONOR—Serpents may hiss, but good men will hear. (Cries again of "Put him out;" calls to order; confusion for a time.)

THE PRESIDENT—If anybody hisses here, remember that every one has his own peculiar way of expressing himself, and as some birds only understand hissing, they must hiss. (Applause.)

Mr. O'CONOR—Gentlemen, there is an animal upon this earth that has no faculty of making its sentiments known in any other way than by a hiss. I am for equal rights. (Three cheers were here given for Mr. O'Conor, three for Gov. Wise, and three groans for John Brown.) I beg of you, gentlemen, all of you who are of my mind at least, to preserve silence, and leave the hissing animal in the full enjoyment of his natural privileges. (Cries of "Good, good," laughter and applause.) The first of our race that offended was taught to do so by that hissing animal. (Laughter and applause.) The first human society that was ever broken up, through sin and discord, had its happy union dissolved by the entrance of that animal. (Applause.) Therefore, it is his privilege to hiss. Let him hiss on. (Cries of "Good, good," laughter and applause.) Gentlemen, I will not detain you much longer. (Cries of "Go on, go on.") I maintain that negro slavery is not unjust—(a voice—"No, sir," applause,) that it is benign in its influences upon the white man and upon the black. (Voices—"That's so, that's so," applause.) I maintain that it is ordained by nature; that it is a necessity of both races; that in climates where the black race can live and prosper, nature herself enjoins correlative duties on the black man and on the white which cannot be performed except by the preservation, and, if the hissing gentleman please, the perpetuation of negro slavery.

I am fortified in this opinion by the highest tribunal in our country, that venerable exponent of our institutions, and of the principles of justice—the Supreme Court of the United States. That court has held, on this subject, what wise men will ever pronounce to be sound and just doctrine. There are some principles well known, well understood, universally recognized and universally acknowledged among men, that are not to be found written in constitutions or in laws. The people of the United States, at the formation of our Government, were, as they still are, in some sense, peculiar and radically distinguishable from other nations. We were white men, of—what is commonly called, by way of distinction—the Caucasian race. We were a monogamous people; that is to say, we were not Mohammedans, or followers of Joe Smith—with half a dozen wives apiece. (Laughter.) It was a fundamental principle of our civilization that no State could exist or be tolerated in this Union which should not, in that respect, resemble all the other States of the Union. Some other distinctive features might be stated which serve to mark us as a people distinct from others, and incapable of associating on terms of perfect political equality or social equality, as friends and fellow-citizens, with some kinds of people that are to be found upon the face of the earth. As a white nation, we made our Constitution and our laws, vesting all political rights in that race. They, and they alone, constituted, in every political sense, the American people. (Applause.) As to the negro, why, we allowed him to live under the shadow and protection of our laws. We gave him, as we were bound to give him, protection against wrong and outrage; but we denied to him political rights, or the power to govern. We left him, for so long a period as the community in which he dwelt should so order, in the condition of a bondman. (Applause.) Now, gentleman, to that condition the negro is assigned by nature. (Cries of "Bravo," and "That's so," and applause.) Experience shows that his race cannot prosper—that they become extinct in any cold, or in any very temperate clime; but in the warm, the extremely warm regions, his race can be perpetuated, and with proper guardianship, may prosper. He has ample strength, and is competent to labor, but nature denies to him either the intellect to govern or the willingness to work. (Applause.) Both were denied him. That same power which deprived him of the will to labor, gave him in our country, as a recompense, a master to coerce that duty, and convert him into a useful and valuable servant.

(Applause.) I maintain that it is not injustice to leave the negro in the condition in which nature placed him, and for which alone he is adapted. Fitted only for a state of pupilage our slave system gives him a master to govern him and to supply his deficiencies: in this there is no injustice. Neither is it unjust in the master to compel him to labor, and thereby afford to that master a just compensation in return for the care and talent employed in governing him. In this way alone is the negro enabled to render himself useful to himself and to the society in which he is placed.

These are the principles, gentlemen, which the extreme measures of abolitionism compel us to enforce. This is the ground that we must take, or abandon our cherished Union. We must no longer favor political leaders who talk about negro slavery being an evil; nor must we advance the indefensible doctrine that negro slavery is a thing which, although pernicious, is to be tolerated merely because we have made a bargain to tolerate it. We must turn away from the teachings of fanaticism. We must look at negro slavery as it is, remembering that the voice of inspiration, as found in the sacred volume, nowhere condemns the bondage of those who are fit only for bondage. Yielding to the clear decree of nature, and the dictates of sound philosophy, we must pronounce that institution just, benign, lawful and proper. The Constitution established by the fathers of our Republic, which recognized it, must be maintained. And that both may stand together, we must maintain that neither the institution itself, nor the Constitution which upholds it, is wicked or unjust; but that each is sound and wise, and entitled to our fullest support.

We must visit with our execration any man claiming our suffrages, who objects to enforcing, with entire good faith, the provisions of the Constitution in favor of negro slavery, or who seeks, by any indirection, to withhold its protection from the South, or to get away from its obligations upon the North. Let us henceforth support no man for public office whose speech or action tends to induce assaults upon the territory of our Southern neighbors, or to generate insurrection within their borders. (Loud applause.) These are the principles upon which we must act. This is what we must say to our brethren of the South. If we have sent men into Congress who are false to these views, and are seeking to violate the compact which binds us together, we must ask to be forgiven until we have another chance to manifest our will at the ballot-boxes. We must tell them that these men shall be consigned to privacy (applause), and that true men, men faithful to the Constitution, men loving all portions of the country alike, shall be elected in their stead. And, gentlemen, we must do more than promise this—we must perform it. (Loud applause, followed by three cheers for Mr. O'Conor, and a tiger.) But a word more, gentlemen, and I have done. (Cries of "Go on.") I have no doubt at all that what I have said to you this evening will be greatly misrepresented. It is very certain that I have not had time enough properly to enlarge upon and fully to explain the interesting topics on which I have ventured to express myself thus boldly and distinctly, taking upon myself the consequences, be they what they may. (Applause.) But I will say a few words by way of explanation. I have maintained the justice of slavery; I have maintained it, because I hold that the negro is decreed by nature to a state of pupilage under the dominion of the wiser white man, in every clime where God and nature meant the negro should live at all. (Applause.) I say a state of pupilage; and, that I may be rightly understood, I say that it is the duty of the white man to treat him kindly; that it is the interest of the white man to treat him kindly. (Applause.) And further, it is my belief that if the white man, in the States where slavery exists, is not interfered with by the fanatics who are now creating these disturbances, whatever laws, whatever improvements, whatever variations in the conduct of society are necessary for the purpose of enforcing in every instance the dictates of interest and humanity, as between the white man and the black, will be faithfully and fairly carried out in the progress of that improvement in all these things in which we are engaged. It is not pretended that the master has a right to slay his slave; it is not pretended that he has a right to be guilty of harshness and inhumanity to his slave. The laws of all the Southern States forbid that: we have not the right here at the North to be guilty of cruelty toward a horse. It is an indictable offence to commit such cruelty. The same laws exist in the South, and if there is any failure in enforcing them to the fullest extent, it is due to this external force, which is pressing upon the Southern States, and compels them to abstain perhaps from many acts beneficent toward the negro which otherwise would be performed. (Applause.) In truth, in fact, in deed, the white man in the slaveholding States has no more authority by the law of the land over his slave than our laws allows to a father over his minor children. He can no more violate humanity with respect to them, than a father in any of the free States of this Union can exercise acts violative of humanity toward his own son under the age of twenty-one. So far as the law is concerned, you own your boys, and have a right to their services until they are twenty-one. You can make them work for you; you have the right to hire out their services and take their earnings; you have the right to chastise them with judgment and reason if they violate your commands; and they are entirely without political rights. Not one of them at the age of twenty years and eleven months even can go to the polls and give a vote. Therefore, gentlemen, before the law, there is but one difference between the free white man of twenty years of age in the Northern States, and the negro bondman in

the Southern States. The white man is to be emancipated at twenty-one, because his God-given intellect entitles him to emancipation and fits him for the duties to devolve upon him. The negro, to be sure, is a bondman for life. He may be sold from one master to another, but where is the ill in that?—one may be as good as another. If there be laws with respect to the mode of sale, which by separating man and wife do occasionally lead to that which shocks humanity, and may be said to violate all propriety and all conscience—if such things are done, let the South alone and they will correct the evil. Let our brethren of the South take care of their own domestic institutions and they will do it. (Applause.) They will so govern themselves as to suppress acts of this description, if they are occasionally committed, as perhaps they are, and we must all admit that they are contrary to just conceptions of right and humanity. I have never yet heard of a nation conquered from evil practices, brought to the light of civilization, brought to the light of religion or the knowledge of the Gospel by the bayonet, by the penal laws, or by external persecutions of any kind. It is not by declamation and outcry against a people from those abroad and outside of their territory that you can improve their manners or their morals in any respect. No; if, standing outside of their territory, you attack the errors of a people, you make them cling to their faults. From a sentiment somewhat excusable—somewhat akin to self-respect and patriotism—they will resist their nation's enemy. Let our brethren of the South alone, gentlemen, and if there be any errors of this kind, they will correct them.

There is but one way in which you can thus leave them to the guidance of their own judgment—by which you can retain them in this Union as our brethren, and perpetuate this glorious Union; and that is, by resolving—without reference to the political party or faction to which any one of you may belong, without reference to the name, political or otherwise, which you may please to bear—resolving that the man, be he who he may, who advocates the doctrine that negro slavery is unjust, and ought to be assailed or legislated against, or who agitates the subject of extinguishing negro slavery in any of its forms as a political hobby, that that man shall be denied your suffrages, and not only denied your suffrages, but that you will select from the ranks of the opposite party, or your own, if necessary, the man you like least, who entertains opposite sentiments, but through whose instrumentality you may be enabled to defeat his election, and to secure in the councils of the nation men who are true to the Constitution, who are lovers of the Union—men who cannot be induced by considerations of imaginary benevolence for a people who really do not desire their aid, to sacrifice or to jeopard in any degree the blessings we enjoy under this Union. May it be perpetual.

Great and continued cheering.)

THE REAL QUESTION STATED.

LETTER FROM CHARLES O'CONOR TO A COMMITTEE OF MERCHANTS.

NEW YORK, Dec. 20, 1859.

CHAS. O'CONOR, ESQ.: The undersigned, being desirous of circulating as widely as possible, both at the North and at the South, the proceedings of the Union Meeting held at the Academy of Music last evening, intend publishing in pamphlet form, for distribution, a correct copy of the same.

Will you be so kind as to inform us whether this step meets your approval; and if so, furnish us with a corrected report of your speech delivered by you on that occasion. Yours respectfully,

LEITCH, BURNET & CO.,
GEO. W. & JEHIAL READ,
BRUFF, BROTHER & SEAVER,
C. B. HATCH & CO.,
DAVIS, NOBLE & CO.,
(Formerly FURMAN, DAVIS & Co.,)
WESSON & COX,
CRONIN, HURXTHAL & SEARS,
ATWATER, MULFORD & CO.

GENTLEMEN: The measure you propose meets my entire approval.

I have long thought that our disputes concerning negro slavery would soon terminate, if the public mind could be drawn to the true issue, and steadily fixed upon it. To effect this object was the sole aim of my address.

Though its ministers can never permit the law of the land to be questioned by private judgment, there is, nevertheless, such a thing as natural justice. Natural justice has the Divine sanction; and it is impossible that any human law which conflicts with it should long endure.

Where mental enlightenment abounds, where morality is professed by all, where the mind is free, speech is free, and the press is free, is it impossible, in the nature of things, that a law which is *admitted* to conflict with natural justice, and with God's own mandate, should long endure?

You all will admit that, within certain limits, at least, our Constitution does contain positive guarantees for the preservation of negro slavery in the old States through all time, unless the local legislatures shall think fit to abolish it. And consequently, if negro slavery, however humanely administered or judiciously regulated, be an institution which conflicts with natural justice and with God's law, surely the most vehement and extreme admirers of John Brown's sentiments are right; and their denunciations against the Constitution, and against the most hallowed names connected with it, are perfectly justifiable.

The friends of truth—the patriotic Americans who would sustain their country's honor against foreign rivalry, and defend their country's interests against all assailants, err greatly when they contend with these men on any point but one. Their general principles cannot be refuted; their logic is irresistible; the error, if any there be, is in their premises. They assert that negro slavery is unjust. This, and this alone, of all they say, is capable of being fairly argued against.

If this proposition cannot be refuted, our Union cannot endure, and it ought not to endure.

Our negro bondmen can neither be exterminated nor transported to Africa. They are too numerous for either process, and either, if practicable, would involve a violation of humanity. If they were emancipated, they would relapse into barbarism, or a set of negro States would arise in our midst, possessing political equality, and entitled to social equality. The division of parties would soon make the negro members a powerful body in Congress—would place some of them in high political stations, and occasionally let one into the Executive chair.

It is in vain to say that this could be endured; it is simply impossible.

What then remains to be discussed?

The negro race is upon us. With a Constitution which held them in bondage, our Federal Union might be preserved; but if so holding them in bondage be a thing forbidden by God and Nature, we cannot lawfully so hold them, and the Union must perish.

This is the inevitable result of that conflict which has now reached its climax.

Among us at the North, the sole question for reflection, study, and friendly interchange of thought should be—Is negro slavery unjust? The rational and dispassionate inquirer will find no difficulty in arriving at my conclusion. It is fit and proper; it is, in its own nature, as an institution, beneficial to both races; and the effect of this assertion is not diminished by our admitting that many faults are practised under it. Is not such the fact in respect to all human laws and institutions?

I am, gentlemen, with great respect, yours truly,

CHARLES O'CONOR.

To Messrs. Leitch, Burnet & Co.; George W. & Jehial Read; Bruff, Brother & Seaver; C. B. Hatch & Co.; Davis, Noble & Co.; Wesson & Cox; Cronin, Hurxthal & Sears; Atwater, Mulford & Co.

CONFLICTING AUTHORITIES.

At the Union-saving meeting in New York city, wherein sundry gentlemen distinguished themselves no less for their lofty patriotism in preventing the dissolution of the Union than for their generous abuse of the Republican party in general, and Gov. Seward in particular, the speech of Mr. O'Conor was the gem of the occasion. The clerical patriotism and happy forgetfulness of the reverend theologian; the stately and heavy grandeur of the ex-Governor; the splendid hits and magnificent periods of the chameleon Thayer — all pale before the effort of this distinguished orator of the legal profession. It is, however, deserving of special notice, not on account of its novelty, its logic, or its moral tone, but for the simple fact that the leading Democratic journals have pronounced it a bold and manly effort, and assumed it as the key-note of Democratic conservatism. As a lawyer, Mr. O'Conor, in giving utterance to his extreme Pro-Slavery sentiments, so utterly abhorrent to the intelligence and moral sense of the North, should at least have attempted to fortify his doctrine by a show of authority or logical argument.

We do not, however, deny the right of this distinguished advocate, in presenting the case of his Southern clients and of the Northern Democracy, to take his own course; but we propose to call him and several other witnesses, whom he himself will recognize as men of some eminence as lawyers, jurists, statesmen, philosophers, and theologians, and present their testimony to the American people, in order that they may come to a right conclusion as to the success of Mr. Charles O'Conor's defense of Slavery, and its Democratic indorsement. And first, consider an extract from Mr. O'Conor's speech upon this subject of Slavery:

"It (Negro Slavery) is not only not unjust, it is just, wise and beneficent."—*Charles O'Conor.*

This *ipse dixit* closes the case on the part of the Democracy. Now, on the other hand:

"Slavery is inconsistent with the genius of Republicanism—it lessens the sense of the equal rights of mankind, and habituates us to tyranny and oppression."—*Luther Martin, of Md.*

"It (Slavery) is so odious that nothing can be sufficient to support it but positive law."—*Lord Mansfield.*

"It is injustice to permit slavery to remain for a single hour."—*William Pitt.*

"Slavery is contrary to the fundamental law of all societies."—*Montesquieu.*

"Slavery, in all its forms, in all its degrees, is a violation of divine law, and a degradation of human nature."—*Brissot.*

"Those are men-stealers who abduct, keep, sell or buy slaves or freemen."—*Grotius.*

"Slavery is detrimental to virtue and industry."—*Beattie.*

"Slavery is a system of outrage and robbery."—*Socrates.*

"Slavery is a system of the most complete injustice."—*Plato.*

"While men despise fraud, and loathe rapine, and abhor blood, they will reject with indignation the wild and guilty phantasy that man can hold property in man."—*Brougham.*

"Slavery is a state so improper, so degrading, so ruinous to the feelings and capacities of human nature, that it ought not to be suffered to exist."—*Burke.*

"No man is by nature the property of another."—*Dr. Johnson.*

"A system (Slavery) which is not only opposed to all the principles of morality, but as it appears to me, is pregnant with appalling and inevitable danger to the Republic."—*Baron Humboldt.*"

"Every man has a property in his own person—this nobody has a right to but himself."—*Locke.*

"It perverts human reason, and induces men endowed with logical powers to maintain that Slavery is sanctioned by the Christian religion."—*John Q. Adams.*

"I never would consent and never have consented that there should be one foot of slavery territory beyond what the old thirteen States had at the formation of the Union. Never, never."—*Daniel Webster.*

"It (Slavery) ought not to be introduced nor permitted in any of the new States."—*John Jay.*

"Natural liberty is the gift of the beneficent Creator of the whole human race."—*Alex Hamilton.*

"Slavery is an atrocious debasement of human nature."—*Franklin.*

"It (Slavery) impairs our strength as a community, and poisons our morals at the fountain head."—*Judge Gaston of N. Carolina.*

"The evils of this system (Slavery) cannot be enumerated." *George W. Summers, of Va.*

"So long as God allows the vital current to flow through my veins, I will never, never, never, by word or thought, by mind or will, aid in submitting one rood of free territory to the everlasting curse of Human Bondage."—*Henry Clay.*

"Sir, I envy neither the heart nor the head of that man from the North who rises here (in Congress) to defend Slavery from principle."—*John Randolph.*

"We have found that this evil (Slavery) has preyed upon the very vitals of the Union, and has been prejudicial to all the States in which it has existed."—*James Monroe.*

"The abolition of domestic Slavery is the greatest object of desire in these Colonies, where it was unhappily introduced in their infant state."—*Thomas Jefferson.*

"I can only say that there is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it (Slavery).—*Geo. Washington.*

For Mr. O'Conor's special benefit, we introduce two other witnesses:

"Not only does the Christian religion, but nature herself cry out against the state of Slavery."—*Pope Leo X.*

"We further reprobate, by our Apostolic authority, all the above offences (traffic in slaves and holding them in slavery) as utterly unworthy of the Christian name.—*Pope Gregory XVI.*

We simply add that the Roman Catholic Church, the Lutheran, the Greek, the Nestorian, the Church of England, the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, the Reformed Churches of France, Switzerland, and Holland; indeed, the whole Protestant Church—all, except a few churches in the Southern States—now, and at all times, have deplored and denounced human bondage, as a social, moral and political evil—either by their creeds, laws, or constitutions, or by the authoritative opinions of their most eminent divines. And yet, Mr. Charles O'Conor, as the representative man of the vast multitude of the Union-saving Democracy—standing in the great commercial emporium of this great Republic—has the effrontery to proclaim (and is applauded for so proclaiming) that the system of Negro Slavery, which the United voices of the great and the good, in all ages, and which the advancing civilization of the whole of Christendom unite in denouncing as abhorrent to all law, human and divine, "is not only not unjust, but is just, wise and beneficent." And the Pro-slavery Democracy not only does not condemn the utterance of this abominable sentiment, but sustains and applauds it!

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS.

FOR THE CAMPAIGN OF 1860.

No. 1.

SPEECH OF WILLIAM H. SEWARD—The Irrepressible Conflict—Delivered at Rochester, Monday, October 25, 1858—Together with Charles O'Conor's Speech, delivered at the Union Meeting in New York city, December 19, 1859.—Price, per single copy, (including both Speeches,) 2 cents; per dozen copies, 20 cents; per hundred, $1; per thousand, $8.

No. 2.

SENATOR SEWARD'S GREAT SPEECH—Freedom and The Union—Delivered February 29, 1860, in the Senate of the United States.—Price, per single copy, 2 cents; per dozen copies, 20 cents; per hundred, $1; per thousand, $8.

No. 3.

SPEECHES OF HON. HENRY WILSON, of Massachusetts—Democratic Leaders for Disunion—Delivered in the Senate of the United States, January 25 and 26, 1860.—Price, per single copy, (including both Speeches,) 2 cents; per dozen copies, 20 cents; per hundred, $1; per thousand, $8.

No. 4.

SPEECH OF HON. S. H. HAMMOND—Freedom National, Slavery Sectional—In Vindication of the Principles of the Republican Party, delivered in the Senate of the State of New York, February, 1860.—Price, per single copy, 2 cents; per dozen copies, 20 cents; per hundred, $1; per thousand, $8.

EVENING JOURNAL ALMANAC FOR 1860—Containing Election Returns of all the States, and Returns by Election Districts of the State of New York, with a large amount of other Political Statistics.—Price, $7 per hundred.

REGISTRY BOOKS, FOR INSPECTORS OF ELECTION—Indispensable for a correct Registry.—Price (including Poll Lists) $3 per dozen.

☞ Address, for either of the above,

WEED, PARSONS & COMPANY, 59 State St., Albany.

ALBANY JOURNAL FOR THE CAMPAIGN, SIX MONTHS.

Ten copies, to one address,	$5 00	Fifty copies, to one address,	$18 00
Twenty copies, to one address,	8 00	One hundred copies, to one address,	35 00

DAILY JOURNAL—At the rate of $7 per annum.

SEMI-WEEKLY JOURNAL—At the rate of $3 per annum, in advance.

☞ Address,

WEED, DAWSON & COMPANY, 59 State Street, Albany.

Albany, February, 1860.

Freedom and the Union.

SPEECH

OF

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

IN VINDICATION OF

FREEDOM AND THE UNION,

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1860.

☞ PLEASE CIRCULATE. ☜

ALBANY:
WEED, PARSONS & CO., PRINTERS AND STEREOTYPERS.
1860.

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS.

FOR THE CAMPAIGN OF 1860.

I.

SENATOR SEWARD'S GREAT SPEECH, of Feb. 29, 1860—$1 per 100; $8 per 1,000.

II.

SENATOR HAMMOND'S SPEECH, in Vindication of the Principles of the Republican Party—$1 per 100; $8 per 1,000.

III.

EVENING JOURNAL ALMANAC FOR 1860—Containing Election Returns of all the States, and Returns by Election Districts of the State of New York, with a large amount of other Political Statistics. Price, $7 per 100.

IV.

REGISTRY BOOKS, FOR INSPECTORS OF ELECTION—Indispensable for a correct Registry. Price (including Poll Lists) $3 per dozen.

☞ Address, for either of the above,

WEED, PARSONS & CO., 59 State Street, Albany.

ALBANY JOURNAL FOR THE CAMPAIGN, SIX MONTHS.

Ten copies, to one address,	$5 00	Fifty copies, to one address,	$18 00
Twenty copies, to one address,	8 00	One hundred copies, to one address,	35 00

DAILY JOURNAL—At the Rate of $7 per annum, in advance.

SEMI-WEEKLY JOURNAL—At the rate of $3 per annum, in advance.

☞ Address, WEED, DAWSON & CO., 59 State Street, Albany.

ALBANY, February, 1860.

SPEECH

OF

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

IN VINDICATION OF

FREEDOM AND THE UNION.

IN SENATE, WEDNESDAY, FEB. 29, 1860.

Mr. President—The admission of Kansas into the Union, without further delay, seems to me equally necessary, just and wise. In recorded debates I have already anticipated the arguments for this conclusion.

In coming forward among the political astrologers, it shall be an error of judgment, and not of disposition, if my interpretation of the feverish dreams which are disturbing the country shall tend to foment, rather than to allay, the national excitement. I shall say nothing unnecessarily of persons, because, in our system, the public welfare and happiness depend chiefly on institutions, and very little on men. I shall allude but briefly to incidental topics, because they are ephemeral, and, because, even in the midst of appeals to passion and prejudice, it is always safe to submit solid truth to the deliberate consideration of all honest and enlightened people.

It will be an overflowing source of shame, as well as of sorrow, if we, thirty millions—Europeans by extraction, Americans by birth or discipline, and Christians in faith, and meaning to be such in practice—cannot so combine prudence with humanity, in our conduct concerning the one disturbing subject of Slavery, as not only to preserve our unequaled institutions of Freedom, but also to enjoy their benefits with contentment and harmony.

Wherever a guiltless slave exists, be he Caucasian, American, Malay or African, he is the subject of two distinct and opposite ideas—one that he is wrongly, the other that he is rightly, a slave. The balance of numbers, on either side, however great, never completely extinguishes this difference of opinion, for there are always some defenders of Slavery outside, even if there are none inside a Free State, while, also, there are always outside, if there are not inside of every Slave State, many who assert with Milton, that "no man who knows aught can be so stupid to deny that all men naturally were born free, being the image and resemblance of God himself, and were by privilege above all the creatures, born to command and not to obey." It often, perhaps generally, happens, however, that in considering the subject of Slavery, society seems to overlook the natural right or personal interest of the slave himself, and to act exclusively for the welfare of the citizen. But this fact does not materially affect ultimate results, for the elementary question of the rightfulness or wrongfulness of Slavery inheres in every form that discussion concerning it assumes. What is just to one class of men can never be injurious to any other; and what is unjust to any condition of persons in a State, is necessarily injurious in some degree to the whole community. An economical question early arises out of the subject of Slavery—labor either of freemen or of slaves is the cardinal necessity of society. Some States choose the one kind, some the other. Hence two municipal systems widely different arise. The Slave State strikes down and affects to extinguish the personality of the laborer, not only as a member of the political body, but as a parent, husband, child, neighbor or friend. He thus becomes, in a political view, merely property without moral capacity, and without domestic, moral and social relations, duties, rights and remedies—a chattel, an object of bargain, sale, gift, inheritance, or theft. His earnings are compensated and his wrongs atoned, not to himself, but to his owner. The State protects not the slave as a man, but the capital of another man, which he represents. On the other hand, the State which rejects Slavery encourages, and animates and invigorates the laborer by maintaining and developing his natural personality in all the rights and faculties of manhood, and generally with the privileges of citizenship. In the one case capital invested in slaves becomes a great political force, while in the other

labor thus elevated and enfranchised, becomes the dominating political power. It thus happens that we may, for convenience sake, and not inaccurately, call Slave States capital States, and Free States labor States.

So soon as a State feels the impulses of commerce, or enterprise, or ambition, its citizens begin to study the effects of these systems of capital and labor respectively on its intelligence, its virtue, its tranquillity, its integrity or unity, its defense, its prosperity, its liberty, its happiness, its aggrandizement, and its fame. In other words, the question arises, whether Slavery is a moral, social and political good, or a social, moral and political evil. This is the Slavery question at home. But there is a mutual bond of amity and brotherhood between man and man throughout the world. Nations examine freely the political systems of each other, and of all preceding times, and accordingly as they approve or disapprove of the two systems of capital and labor respectively, they sanction and prosecute, or condemn and prohibit commerce in men. Thus, in one way or in another, the Slavery question which so many among us, who are more willing to rule than patient in studying the conditions of society, think is a merely accidental or unnecessary question that might and ought to be settled and dismissed at once, is, on the contrary, a world-wide and enduring subject of political consideration and civil administration. Men, states, and nations entertain it, not voluntarily, but because the progress of society continually brings it into their way. They divide upon it, not perversely, but because owing to differences of constitution, condition or circumstances, they cannot agree.

The fathers of the Republic encountered it. They even adjusted it so that it might have given us much less than our present disquiet, had not circumstances afterwards occurred which they, wise as they were, had not clearly foreseen. Although they had inherited, yet they generally condemned the practice of Slavery, and hoped for its discontinuance. They expressed this when they asserted in the Declaration of Independence, as a fundamental principle of American society, that all men are created equal, and have inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Each State, however, reserved to itself exclusive political power over the subject of Slavery, within its own borders. Nevertheless, it unavoidably presented itself in their consultations on a bond of Federal Union. The new Government was to be a representative one. Slaves were capital in some States, in others capital had no investments in labor.—Should those slaves be represented as capital or as persons, taxed as capital or as persons, or should they not be represented or taxed at all? The fathers disagreed, debated long, and compromised at last. Each State, they determined, shall have two Senators in Congress. Three-fifths of the slaves shall be elsewhere represented and be taxed as persons. What should be done if the slave escape into a labor State? Should that State confess him to be a chattel, and restore him as such; or might it regard him as a person, and harbor and protect him as a man? They compromised again, and decided that no person held to labor or service in one State by the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall by any law or regulation of that State, be discharged from such labor or service, but shall be delivered up on claim, to the person to whom such labor or service shall be due.

Free laborers would immigrate, and slaves might be imported into the States. The fathers agreed that Congress may establish uniform laws of naturalization, and it might prohibit the importation of persons after 1808. Communities in the Southwest, detached from the Southern States, were growing up in the practice of Slavery, to be called States. New States would soon grow up in the Northwest, while as yet capital stood aloof, and labor had not lifted the ax to begin there its endless but beneficent task. The fathers authorized Congress to make all needful rules and regulations concerning the management and disposition of the public lands and to admit new States. So the Constitution, while it does not disturb or affect the system of capital in slaves, existing in any State under its own laws, does, at the same time, recognize every human being, when within any exclusive sphere of Federal jurisdiction, not as capital but as a person.

What was the action of the fathers in Congress? They admitted the new States of the Southwest as capital States, because it was practically impossible to do otherwise, and by the ordinance of 1787, confirmed in 1789, they provided for the organization and admission of only labor States, in the Northwest. They directed fugitives from justice to be restored not as chattels, but as persons. They awarded naturalization to immigrant free laborers, and they prohibited the trade in African labor. This disposition of the whole subject was in harmony with the condition of society, and, in the main, with the spirit of the age. The seven Northern States contentedly became labor States by their own acts. The six other States, with equal tranquillity and by their own determination remained capital States.

The circumstances which the fathers did not clearly foresee were two, namely: the reinvigoration of Slavery consequent on the increased consumption of cotton, and the extension of the national domain across the Mississippi, and these occurred before 1820. The State of Louisiana, formed on a slaveholding French settlement, within the newly acquired Louisiana Territory, had then already been admitted into the Union. There yet remained, however, a vast region which included Arkansas and Missouri, together with the then unoccupied and even unnamed Kansas and Nebraska. Arkansas, a slaveholding community, was nearly ready to apply, and Missouri, another such Territory, was actually applying for admission into the Federal Union. The existing capital States seconded these applications, and claimed that the whole Louisianian Territory was rightfully open to Slavery, and to the organization of future Slave States. The labor States maintained that Congress had supreme legislative power within the domain, and could and ought to exclude Slavery there. The question thus opened was one which related not at all to Slavery in the existing capital States. It was purely and simply a national question whether the common interest of the whole Republic required that Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, should become capital States, with all the evils and dangers of Slavery, or be labor States with all the security, benefits and blessings of freedom. On the de-

cision was suspended the question. as was thought, whether ultimately the interior of this new continent should be an asylum for the oppressed and the exile, coming year after year and age after age, voluntarily from every other civilized land, as well as for the children of misfortune in our own, or whether. through the renewal of the African slave trade, those magnificent and luxuriant regions should be surrendered to the control of capital, wringing out the fruit of the earth through the impoverishing toil of negro slaves. That question of 1820 was identically the question of 1860, so far as principle, and even the field of its application was concerned. Every element of the controversy now present entered it then; the rightfulness or the wrongfulness of Slavery; its effects, present and future; the Constitutional authority of Congress; the claims of the States, and of their citizens; the nature of the Federal Union, whether it is a compact between the States, or an independent Government; the springs of its powers, and the ligatures upon their exercise. All these were discussed with zeal and ability, which have never been surpassed. History tells us, I know not how truly, that the Union reeled under the vehemence of that great debate. Patriotism took counsel from prudence. and enforced a settlement which has proved to be not a final one; and which, as is now seen, practically left open all the great political issues which were involved. Missouri and Arkansas were admitted as capital States. while labor obtained, as a reservation, the abridged yet comprehensive field of Kansas and Nebraska.

Now, when the present conditions of the various parts of the Louisianian Territory are observed, and we see that capital retains undisputed possession of what it then obtained, while labor is convulsing the country with so hard and so prolonged a struggle to regain the lost equivalent which was then guaranteed to it under circumstances of so great solemnity, we may well desire not to be undeceived if the Missouri Compromise was indeed unnecessarily accepted by the Free States influenced by exaggerations of the dangers of Disunion. The Missouri debate disclosed truths of great moment for ulterior use:

First: That it is easy to combine the capital States in defense of even external interests, while it is hard to unite the labor States in a common policy.

Second: That the labor States have a natural loyalty to the Union, while the capital States have a natural facility for alarming that loyalty by threatening Disunion.

Third: That the capital States do not practically distinguish between legitimate and constitutional resistance to the extension of Slavery in the common Territories of the Union, and unconstitutional aggression against Slavery established by local laws in the capital States.

The early political parties were organized without reference to Slavery. But since 1820, European questions have left us practically unconcerned. There has been a great increase of invention, mining, manufacture, and cultivation. Steam on land and on water has quickened commerce. The press and the telegraph have attained prodigious activity, and the social intercourse between the States and their citizens has been immeasurably increased; and consequently, their mutual relations affecting Slavery have been for many years, subjects of earnest and often excited discussion. It is in my way only to show how such disputes have operated on the course of political events—not to re-open them for argument here. There was a slave insurrection in Virginia. Virginia and Kentucky debated, and, to the great sorrow of the Free States, rejected the system of voluntary labor. The Colonization Society was established with much favor in the capital States. Emancipation Societies arose in the Free States. South Carolina instituted proceedings to nullify obnoxious Federal revenue laws. The capital States complained of Courts and Legislatures in the labor States, for interpreting the constitutional provision for the surrender of fugitives from service so as to treat them as persons and not property, and they discriminated against colored persons of the labor States when they came to the capital States. They denied, in Congress, the right of petition, and embarrassed or denied freedom of debate on the subject of Slavery. Presses, which undertook the defense of the labor system in the capital States, were suppressed by violence; and even in the labor States, public assemblies, convened to consider Slavery questions, were dispersed by mobs sympathizing with the capital States.

The Whig party, being generally an opposition party, practised some forbearance toward the interest of labor. The Democratic party, not without demonstrations of dissent, was generally found sustaining the policy of capital. A disposition toward the removal of Slavery from the presence of the national capitol appeared in the District of Columbia. Mr. Van Buren, a Democratic President, launched a prospective veto against the anticipated measure. A Democratic Congress brought Texas into the Union, stipulating practically for its future reorganization into four slave States. Mexico was incensed. War ensued. The labor States asked that the Mexican law of liberty, which covered the Territories brought in by the treaty of peace, might remain and be confirmed. The Democratic party refused. The Missouri debate of 1820 recurred now, under circumstances of heat and excitement, in relation to these conquests. The defenders of labor took alarm lest the number of new capital States might become so great as to enable that class of States to dictate the whole policy of the Government; and in case of constitutional resistance, then to form a new slaveholding confederacy around the Gulf of Mexico. By this time the capital States seemed to have become fixed in a determination that the Federal Government, and even the labor States, should recognise their slaves, though outside of the Slave States and within the Territories of the United States, as property of which the master could not be in any way, or by any authority divested; and the labor States, having become now more essentially Democratic than ever before, by the great development of free labor, more firmly than ever insisted on the constitutional doctrine that slaves voluntarily carried by their masters into the common Territories, or into the labor States, are persons, men.

Under the auspicious influences of a Whig success, California and New Mexico appeared before Congress as labor States. The capital States refused to consent to their admission into the Union; and again threats of Disunion carried

terror and consternation throughout the land.—Another compromise was made. Specific enactments admitted California as a labor State, and remanded New Mexico and Utah to remain Territories, with the right to choose Freedom or Slavery when ripened into States, while they gave new remedies for the reception of fugitives from service, and abolished the open slave market in the District of Columbia. These new enactments, collated with the existing statutes, namely, the Ordinance of 1787, the Missouri Prohibitory law of 1820, and the articles of Texas annexation, disposed by law of the subject of Slavery in all the Territories of the United States. And so the Compromise of 1850 was pronounced a full, final, absolute and comprehensive settlement of all existing and all possible disputes concerning Slavery under Federal authority. The two great parties, fearful for the Union, struck hands in making and presenting this as an adjustment, never afterwards to be opened, disturbed, or even questioned, and the people accepted it by majorities unknown before. The new President, chosen over an illustrious rival, unequivocally on the ground of greater ability, even if not more reliable purpose to maintain the new treaty inviolate, made haste to justify this expectation when Congress assembled. He said:

"When the grave shall have closed over all who are now endeavoring to meet the obligations of duty, the year 1850 will be recurred to as a period filled with anxiety and apprehension. A successful war has just terminated; peace brought with it a great augmentation of territory. Disturbing questions arose bearing upon the domestic institutions of a portion of the Confederacy, and involving the constitutional rights of the States.—But, notwithstanding differences of opinion and sentiment, in relation to details and specific provisions, the acquiescence of distinguished citizens, whose devotion to the Union can never be doubted, has given renewed vigor to our institutions, and restored a sense of security and repose to the public mind throughout the Confederacy. That this repose is to suffer no shock during my official term, if I have the power to avert it, those who placed me here may be assured."

Hardly, however, had these inspiring sounds died away, throughout a reassured and delighted land, before the national repose was shocked again—shocked, indeed, as it had never been, and smitten this time by a blow from the very hand that had just released the chords of the national harp from their utterance of that exalted symphony of peace.

Kansas and Nebraska, the long devoted reservation of labor and Freedom, saved in the agony of national fear in 1820, and saved again in the panic of 1850, were now to be opened by Congress, that the never ending course of seed time and harvest might begin. The slave capitalists of Missouri, from their own well assured homes on the eastern banks of their noble river, looked down upon and coveted the fertile prairies of Kansas; while a sudden terror ran through all the capital States, when they saw a seeming certainty that at last a new labor State would be built on their western border, inevitably fraught, as they said, with a near or remote abolition of Slavery. What could be done? Congress could hardly be expected to intervene directly for their safety so soon after the Compromise of 1850. The labor hive of the Free States was distant, the way new, unknown, and not without perils. Missouri was near and watchful, and held the keys of the gates of Kansas. She might seize the new and smiling Territory by surprise, if only Congress would remove the barrier established in 1820. The conjuncture was favorable. Clay and Webster, the distinguished citizens whose unquestionable devotion to the Union was manifested by their acquiescence in the compromise of 1850, had gone down already into their honored graves. The labor States had dismissed, many of their representatives here for too great distrust of the efficacy of that new bond of peace, and had replaced them with partisans who were only timid, but not unwilling. The Democratic President and Congress hesitated, but not long. They revised the last great compromise, and found, with delighted surprise, that it was so far from confirming the law of freedom of 1820, that, on the other hand, it exactly provided for the abrogation of that venerated statute; nay, that the compromise itself actually killed the spirit of the Missouri law, and devolved on Congress the duty of removing the lifeless letter from the National Code. The deed was done. The new enactment not only repealed the Missouri prohibition of Slavery, but it pronounced the people of Kansas and Nebraska perfectly free to establish Freedom or Slavery, and pledged Congress to admit them in due time as States, either of capital or of labor, into the Union. The Whig representatives of the capital States, in an hour of strange bewilderment, concurred; and the Whig party instantly went down, never to rise again. Democrats seceded, and stood aloof; the country was again confounded; and, amid the perplexities of the hour, a Republican party was seen gathering itself together with much earnestness, but with little show of organization, to rescue, if it were not now too late, the cause of Freedom and Labor, so unexpectedly and grievously imperiled in the Territories of the United States.

I will not linger over the sequel. The popular sovereignty of Kansas proved to be the State sovereignty of Missouri, not only in the persons of the rulers, but even in the letter of an arbitrary and cruel code. The perfect freedom proved to be a hateful and intolerable bondage. From 1855 to 1860, Kansas, sustained and encouraged only by the Republican party, has been engaged in successive and ever-varying struggles, which have taxed all her virtue, wisdom, moderation, energies and resources, and often even her physical strength and martial courage, to save herself from being betrayed into the Union as a Slave State. Nebraska, though choosing freedom, is, through the direct exercises of the Executive power, overriding her own will, held as a Slave Territory; and New Mexico has relapsed voluntarily into the practice of slavery, from which she had redeemed herself while she yet remained a part of the Mexican Republic. Meantime, the Democratic party, advancing from the ground of Popular Sovereignty as far as that ground is from the Ordinance of 1787, now stands on the position that both Territorial Governments and Congress are incompetent to legislate against slavery in the Territories, while they are not only competent, but are obliged, when it is necessary, to legislate for its protection there.

In this new and extreme position the Democratic party now masks itself behind the battery of the Supreme Court, as if it were possibly a true construction of the Constitution, that the power of deciding practically forever between Freedom and Slavery in a portion of the consti-

ment far exceeding all that is yet organized, should be renounced by Congress, which alone possesses any legislative authority, and should be assumed and exercised by a court which can only take cognizance of the great question collaterally, in a private action between individuals, and which action the Constitution will not suffer the court to entertain, if it involves twenty dollars of money, without the overruling intervention of a jury of twelve good and lawful men of the neighborhood where the litigation arises. Even the independent, ever renewed, and ever-recurring representative Parliament, Diet, Congress, or Legislature, is the one chief, paramount, essential, indispensable institution in a Republic. Even liberty, guaranteed by organic law, yet if it be held by other tenure than the guardian care of such a representative popular assembly, is but precariously maintained, while Slavery, enforced by an irresponsible judicial tribunal, is the completest possible development of despotism.

Mr. President, did ever the annals of any Government show a more rapid or more complete departure from the wisdom and virtue of its founders? Did ever the Government of a great empire, founded on the rights of human labor, slide away so fast and so far, and moor itself so tenaciously on the basis of capital, and that capital invested in laboring men? Did ever a free representative Legislature, invested with powers so great, and with the guardianship of rights so important, of trusts so sacred, of interests so precious, and of hopes at once so noble and so comprehensive, surrender and renounce them all so unnecessarily, so unwisely, so fatally, and so ingloriously? If it be true, as every instinct of our nature, and every precept of political experience teaches us, that

> "Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates, and men decay,"

then where in Ireland, in Italy, in Poland, or in Hungary, has any ruler prepared for a generous and confiding people disappointments, disasters, and calamities equal to those which the Government of the United States holds now suspended over so large a portion of the continent of North America?

Citizens of the United States, in the spirit of this policy, subverted the free Republic of Nicaragua, and opened it to slavery and the African slave trade, and held it in that condition waiting annexation to the United States, until its sovereignty was restored by a combination of sister Republics exposed to the same danger and apprehensive of similar subversion. Other citizens reopened the foreign slave trade, in violation of our laws and treaties; and, after a suspension of that shameful traffic for fifty years, savage Africans have been once more landed on our shores, and distributed, unclaimed and with impunity, among our plantations.

For this policy, so far as the Government has sanctioned it, the Democratic party avows itself responsible. Everywhere complaint against it is denounced, and its opponents proscribed. When Kansas was writhing under the wounds of incipient, servile war, because of her resistance, the Democratic press deridingly said, "let her bleed." Official integrity has been the cause for rebuke and punishment, when it resisted frauds designed to promote the extension of slavery. Throughout the whole Republic there is not one known dissenter from that policy remaining in place, if within reach of the Executive arm. Nor over the face of the whole world is there to be found one representative of our country who is not an apologist of the extension of Slavery.

It is in America that these things have happened. In the nineteenth century, the era of the world's greatest progress, and while all nations but ourselves have been either abridging or altogether suppressing commerce in men; at the very moment when the Russian serf is emancipated, and the Georgian captive, the Nubian prisoner, and the Abyssinian savage, are lifted up to freedom by the successor of Mohammed. The world, prepossessed in our behalf by our early devotion to the rights of human nature, as no nation ever before engaged its respect and sympathies, asks, in wonder and amazement, what all this demoralization means? It has an excuse better than the world can imagine, better than we are generally conscious of ourselves—a virtuous excuse. We have loved not freedom so much less, but the union of our country much more. We have been made to believe, from time to time, that, in a crisis, both of these precious institutions could not be saved together, and therefore we have, from time to time, surrendered safeguards of freedom to propitiate the loyalty of capital, and stay its hands from doing violence to the Union. The true state of the case, however, ought not to be a mystery to ourselves. Prescience, indeed, is not given to statesmen; but we are without excuse when we fail to apprehend the logic of current events. Let parties, or the Government choose or do what they may, the people of the United States do not prefer the wealth of the few to the liberty of the many, capital to labor, African slaves to white freemen, in the national Territories and future States. That question has never been distinctly recognized or acted on by them. The Republican party embodies the popular protest and reaction against a policy which has been fastened upon the nation by surprise, and which its reason and conscience, concurring with the reason and conscience of mankind, condemn.

The choice of the nation is now between the Democratic party and the Republican party. Its principles and policy are, therefore, justly and even necessarily examined. I know of only one policy which it has adopted or avowed, namely: the saving of the Territories of the United States, if possible, by constitutional and lawful means, from being homes for slavery and Polygamy. Who, that considers where this nation exists, of what races it is composed, in what age of the world it acts its part on the public stage, and what are its predominant institutions, customs, habits and sentiments, doubts that the Republican party can and will, if unwaveringly faithful to that policy, and just and loyal in all beside, carry it into triumphal success? To doubt is to be uncertain whether civilization can improve or Christianity save mankind.

I may, perhaps, infer, from the necessity of the case, that it will, in all courts and places, stand by the freedom of speech and of the press, and the constitutional rights of freemen everywhere; that it will favor the speedy improvement of the public domain by homestead laws, and will encourage mining, manufactures, and internal commerce, with needful connections between the Atlantic and Pacific States—for all these are important interests of Freedom. For

all the rest, the national emergencies, not individual influences, must determine, as society goes on, the policy, and character of the Republican party. Already bearing its part in legislation and in treaties, it feels the necessity of being practical in its care of the national health and life, while it leaves metaphysical speculation to those whose duty it is to cultivate the ennobling science of political philosophy.

But in the midst of these subjects, or, rather, before fully reaching them, the Republican party encounters, unexpectedly, a new and potential issue—one prior, and therefore paramount to all others, one of national life and death. Just as if so much had not been already conceded; nay, just as if nothing at all had ever been conceded, to the interest of capital invested in men, we hear menaces of Disunion, louder, more distinct, more emphatic than ever, with the condition annexed, that they shall be executed the moment that a Republican Administration, though constitutionally elected, shall assume the Government.

I do not certainly know that the people are prepared to call such an Administration to power. I know only, that through a succession of floods which never greatly excite, and ebbs which never entirely discourage me, the volume of Republicanism rises continually higher and higher. They are probably wise, whose apprehensions admonish them that it is already strong enough for effect.

Hitherto the Republican party has been content with one self-interrogatory—how many votes it can cast? These threats enforce another—has it determination enough to cast them? This latter question touches its spirit and pride. I am quite sure, however, that, as it has hitherto practised self-denial in so many other forms, it will, in this emergency, lay aside all impatience of temper, together with all ambition, and will consider these extraordinary declamations seriously, and with a just moderation. It would be a waste of words to demonstrate that they are unconstitutional, and equally idle to show that the responsibility for disunion, attempted or effected, must rest not with those who in the exercise of constitutional authority maintain the Government, but with those who unconstitutionally engage in the mad work of subverting it.

What are the excuses for these menaces? They resolve themselves into this: that the Republican party in the North is hostile to the South. But it already is proved to be a majority in the North; it is, therefore, practically the people of the North. Will it not still be the same North that has forborne with you so long and conceded to you so much? Can you justly assume that affection which has been so complying can all at once change to hatred, intense and inexorable?

You say that the Republican party is a sectional one. Is the Democratic party less sectional? Is it easier for us to bear your sectional sway that for you to bear ours? Is it unreasonable that for once we should alternate? But is the Republican party sectional? Not unless the Democratic party is. The Republican party prevails in the House of Representatives sometimes; the Democratic party in the Senate always. Which of the two is the most proscriptive? Come, if you will, into the Free States, into the State of New York, anywhere from Lake Erie to Sag Harbor, among my neighbors in the Owasco Valley. Hold your conventions, nominate your candidates, address the people, submit to them, fully, earnestly, eloquently, all your complaints and grievances of Northern disloyalty, oppression, perfidy; keep nothing back, speak just as freely and as loudly there as you do here. You will have hospitable welcomes, and appreciating audiences, with ballot-boxes open for all the votes you can win. Are you less sectional than this? Extend to us the same privileges, and I will engage that you will very soon have in the South as many Republicans as Democrats in the North. There is, however, a better test of nationality than the accidental location of parties. Our policy of labor in the Territories, was not sectional in the first forty years of the Republic. Its nature inheres. It will be national again, during the third forty years, and forever afterwards. It is not wise and beneficial for us alone, or injurious to you alone. Its effects are equal, and the same for us all.

You accuse the Republican party of ulterior and secret designs. How can a party that counts its votes in this land of free speech and free press by the hundreds of thousands, have any secret designs? Who is the conjurer, and where are the hidden springs by which he can control its uncongregated and widely-dispersed masses, and direct them to objects unseen and purposes unavowed? But what are these hidden puposes? You name only one. That one is to introduce negro equality among you. Suppose we had the power to change your social system, what warrant have you for supposing that we should carry negro equality among you? We know, and we will show you, if you will only give heed, that what our system of labor works out, wherever it works out anything, is the equality of white men. The laborer in the Free States, no matter how humble his occupation, is a white man, and he is politically the equal of his employer. Eighteen of our thirty-three States are Free-Labor States. There they are:—Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, California and Oregon. I do not array them in contrast with the capital States. I am no assailant of States. All of the States are parcels of my own country—the best of them not so wise and great as I am sure it will hereafter be; the State least developed and perfect among them all is wiser and better than any foreign State I know. Is it then in any, and in which, of the States I have named that negro equality offends the white man's pride? Throughout the wide world, where is the State where class and caste are so utterly extinguished as they are in each and every one of them? Let the European immigrant, who avoids the African as if his skin exhaled contagion, answer. You find him always in the State where labor is ever free. Did Washington, Jefferson and Henry, when they implored you to relinquish your system and accept the one we have adopted, propose to sink you down to the level of the African, or was it their desire to exalt all white men to a common political elevation.

But we do not seek to force, or even to intrude, our system on you. We are excluded, justly,

wisely and contentedly, from all political power and responsibility in your capital States. You are sovereigns on the subject of Slavery within your own borders, as we are on the same subject within our borders. It is well and wisely so arranged. Use your authority to maintain what system you please. We are not distrustful of the result. We have wisely, as we think, exercised ours to protect and perfect the manhood of the members of the State. The whole sovereignty upon domestic concerns within the Union is divided between us by unmistakable boundaries. You have your fifteen distinct parts, equally distinct. Each must be maintained, in order that the whole may be preserved. If curs shall be assailed, within or without, by any enemy, or for any cause, and we shall have need, we shall expect you to defend it. If yours shall be so assailed, in the emergency, no matter what the cause or pretext, or who the foe, we shall defend your sovereignty as the equivalent of our own. We cannot, indeed, accept your system of capital or its ethics. That would be to surrender and subvert our own, which we esteem to be better. Besides, if we could, what need for any division into States at all? You are equally at liberty to reject our system and its ethics, and to maintain the superiority of your own by all the forces of persuasion and argument. We must, indeed, mutually discuss both systems. All the world discusses all systems. Especially must we discuss them since we have to decide as a nation which of the two we ought to engraft on the new and future States growing up in the great public domain. Discussion, then, being unavoidable, what could be more wise than to conduct it with mutual toleration and in a fraternal spirit?

You complain that Republicans discourse too boldly and directly, when they express with confidence their belief that the system of labor will, in the end, be universally accepted by the capital States, acting for themselves, and in conformity with their own Constitutions, while they sanction too unreservedly books designed to advocate emancipation. But surely you can hardly expect the Federal Government or the political parties of the nation to maintain a censorship of the Press or of debate. The theory of our system is, that error of opinion may in all cases safely be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. Will it be claimed that more of moderation and tenderness in debate are exhibited on your side of the great argument than our own? We all learned our polemics, as well as our principles, from a common master. We are sure that we do not, on our side, exceed his lessons and example. Thomas Jefferson addressed Dr. Price, an Englishman, concerning his treatise on emancipation in America, in this fashion:—

"Southward of the Chesapeake, your book will find but few readers concurring with it in sentiment on the subject of Slavery. From the mouth to the head of the Chesapeake, the bulk of the people will approve it in theory, and it will find are spectable minority ready to adopt it in practice; a minority which, for weight and worth of character, preponderates against the greater number who have not the courage to divest their families of a property which, however, keeps their consciences unquiet. Northward of the Chesapeake, you may find here and there an opponent to your doctrine, as you may find here and there a robber or a murderer; but in no great number." * * "This [Virginia] is the next State to which we may turn our eyes for the interesting spectacle of justice in conflict with avarice and oppression—a conflict where the sacred side is gaining daily new recruits from the influx into office of young men, grown and growing up." * * * *

"Be not, then, discouraged. What you have written will do a great deal of good; and could you still trouble yourself about our welfare, no man is more able to help the laboring side."

You see, sir, that whether we go for or against Slavery anywhere, we must follow Southern guides. You may change your pilots with the winds or the currents; but we, whose nativity, reckoned under the North Star, has rendered us somewhat superstitious, must be excused for constancy in following the guidance of those who framed the national ship and gave us the chart for its noble voyage.

A profound respect and friendly regard for the Vice-President of the United States has induced me to weigh carefully the testimony he has given on the subject of the hostility against the South imputed to the Republican party, as derived from the relations of the representatives of the two parties at this capital. He says that he has seen here in the representatives of the lower Southern States a most resolute and earnest spirit of resistance to the Republican party; that he perceives a sensible loss of that spirit of brotherhood and that feeling of loyalty, together with that love for a common country, which are at last the surest cement of the Union; so that, in the present unhappy condition of affairs, he is almost tempted to exclaim that we are dissolving week by week, and month by month; that the threads are gradually fretting themselves asunder; and a stranger might suppose that the Executive of the United States was the President of two hostile Republics. It is not for me to raise a doubt upon the correctness of this dark picture, so far as the Southern groups upon the canvas are concerned, but I must be indulged in the opinion that I can pronounce as accurately concerning the Northern or Republican representatives here as any one. I know their public haunts and their private ways. We are not a hostile Republic, or representatives of one. We confer together, but only as the organs of every party do, and must do in a political system which obliges us to act sometimes as partisans, while it requires us always to be patriots and statesmen. Differences of opinion, even on the subject of Slavery, with us are political, not social or personal differences. There is not one disunionist or disloyalist among us all. We are altogether unconscious of any process of dissolution going on among or around us. We have never been more patient and never loved the representatives of other sections more, than now. We bear the same testimony for the people around us here, who, though in the very center where the bolt of disunion must fall first and be most fearful in its effects, seem never less disturbed than now. We bear the same testimony for all the districts and States we represent. The people of the North are not enemies but friends and brethren of the South, faithful and true as in the days when death has dealt his arrows promiscuously among them on common battle fields of Freedom.

We will not suffer ourselves here to dwell on any evidences of a different temper in the South; but we shall be content with expressing our belief that hostility that is not designedly provoked, and that cannot provoke retaliation, is an anomaly that must be traced to casual excitements, which cannot perpetuate alienation.

A canvass for a Presidential election, in some respects more important, perhaps, than any since

1800, has recently begun. The House of Representatives was to be organized by a majority, while no party should cast more than a plurality of votes. The gloom of the late tragedy in Virginia rested on the Capitol from the day when Congress assembled. While the two great political parties were peacefully, lawfully, and constitutionally, though zealously, conducting the great national issue between free labor and capital labor for the Territories to its proper solution, through the trials of the ballot, operating directly or indirectly on the various departments of the Government, a band of exceptional men, contemptuous equally of that great question and of the parties to the controversy, and impatient of the constitutional system which confines the citizens of every State to political action by suffrage in organized parties within their own borders, inspired by an enthusiasm peculiar to themselves, and exasperated by grievances and wrongs that some of them had suffered by inroads of armed propagandists of Slavery in Kansas, unlawful as their own retaliation was, attempted to subvert Slavery in Virginia by conspiracy, ambush, invasion, and force. The method we have adopted, of appealing to the reason and judgment of the people, to be pronounced by suffrage, is the only way by which free government can be maintained anywhere, and the only one, as yet devised, which is in harmony with the spirit of Christian religion. While generous and charitable natures will probably concede that John Brown and his associates acted on earnest, though fatally erroneous, convictions, yet all good citizens will, nevertheless, agree that this attempt to execute an unlawful purpose in Virginia by invasion, involving servile war, was an act of sedition and treason, and criminal to just the extent that it affected the public peace, and was destructive of human happiness and human life. It is a painful reflection that, after so long an experience of the beneficent working of our system as we have enjoyed, we have had these new illustrations in Kansas and Virginia of the existence among us of a class of men so misguided and so desperate as to seek to enforce their peculiar principles by the sword, drawing after it a need for the further illustration by their punishment of that great moral truth, especially applicable to a republic, that they who take up the sword as a weapon of controversy shall perish by the sword. In the latter case, the lamented deaths of so many citizens slain from an ambush and by surprise—all the more lamentable because they were innocent victims of a frenzy kindled without their agency, in far distant fires—the death even of the offenders themselves, pitiable, although necessary and just, because they acted under delirium, which blinded their judgment to the real motive of their criminal enterprise; the alarm and consternation naturally awakened throughout the country, exciting for the moment the fear that our whole system, with all its securities for life and liberty, was coming to an end—a fear none the more endurable because continually aggravated by new chimeras to which the great leading event lent an air of probability; surely all these constituted a sum of public misery which ought to have satisfied the most morbid appetite for social horrors. But, as in the case of the gunpowder plot, and the Salem witchcraft, and the New York colonial negro plot, so now; the original actors were swiftly followed by another and kindred class, who sought to prolong and widen the public distress by attempting to direct the indignation which it had excited against parties guiltless equally of complicity and of sympathy with the offenders.

Posterity must decide in all the recent cases where political responsibility for public disasters must fall; and posterity will give little heed to our instructions. It was not until the gloomy reign of Domitian had ended, and liberty and virtue had found assured refuge under the sway of the milder Nerva, that the historian arose whose narrative of that period of tyranny and terror has been accepted by mankind.

The Republican party being thus vindicated against the charge of hostility to the South, which has been offered in excuse for the menaces of unconstitutional resistance in the event of its success, I feel well assured that it will sustain me in meeting them in the spirit of the defender of the English Commonwealth:

"Surely they that shall boast as we do to be a free nation, and, having the power, shall not also have the courage, to remove constitutionally every Governor, whether he be the supreme or subordinate, may please their fancy with a ridiculous and painted freedom, fit to cozen babies, but are, indeed, under tyranny and servitude, as wanting that power, which is the root and source of all liberty, to dispose of and economise in the land which God hath given them, as members of family in their own home and free inheritance; without which natural and essential power of a free nation, though bearing high their heads, they can, in due esteem, be thought no better than slaves and vassals born in the tenure and occupation of another inheriting lord, whose government, though not illegal or intolerable, hangs on them as a lordly scourge, not as a free government."

The Republican party knows, as the whole country will ultimately come to understand, that the noblest objects of national life must perish, if that life itself shall be lost, and therefore it will accept the issue tendered. It will take up the word Union, which others are so willing to renounce, and, combining it with that other glorious thought, Liberty, which has been its inspiration so long, it will move firmly onward, with the motto inscribed on its banner: "Union and Liberty, come what may, in victory as in defeat, in power as out of power, now and forever."

If the Republican party maintain the Union, who and what party is to assail it? Only the Democratic party, for there is no other. Will the Democratic party take up the assault? The menaces of Disunion are made, though not in its name, yet in its behalf. It must avow or disavow them. Its silence, thus far, is portentous, but is not alarming. The effect of the intimidation, if successful, would be to continue the rule of the Democratic party, though a minority, by terror. It certainly ought to need no more than this to secure the success of the Republican party. If, indeed, the time has come when the Democratic party must rule by terror, instead of ruling through conceded public confidence, then it is quite certain that it cannot be dismissed too soon. Ruling on that odious principle, it could not long save either the Constitution or public liberty. But I shall not believe the Democratic party will consent to stand in this position, though it does, through the action of its representatives, seem to cover and sustain those who threaten disunion. I know the Democracy of the North. I know them now in their waning strength. I do not know a possi-

ble Disunionist among them all. I believe they will be as faithful to the Union now as they were in the by-gone days when their ranks were full, and their challenge to the combat was always the war-cry of victory. But, if it shall prove otherwise, then the world will all the sooner know that every party in the country must stand on Union ground; that the American people will sustain no party that is not capable of making a sacrifice of its ambition on the altar of the country; that, although a party may have never so much of prestige, and never such traditional merit, yet, if it be lacking in one virtue of loyalty to the Union, all its advantages will be unavailing; and then obnoxious as, through long-cherished and obstinate prejudices, the Republican party is in the capital States, yet even there it will advance like an army with banners, winning the favor of the whole people, and it will be armed with the national confidence and support, when it shall be found the only party that defends and maintains the integrity of the Union.

Those who seek to awake the terrors of disunion, seem to me to have too hastily considered the conditions under which they are to make their attempt. Who believes that a Republican Administration and Congress could practice tyranny under a Constitution which interposes so many checks as ours? Yet that tyranny must not only be practised, but must be intolerable, and there must be no remaining hope for constitutional relief, before forcible resistance can find ground to stand on anywhere.

The people of the United States, acting in conformity with the Constitution, are the supreme tribunal to try and determine all political issues. They are as competent to decide the issue of to-morrow as they have been heretofore to decide the issues of other days. They can reconsider hereafter and reverse, if need be, the judgment they shall pronounce to-day, as they have more than once reconsidered and reversed their judgments in former times. It needs no revolution to correct any error, or prevent any danger, under any circumstances.

Nor is any new or special cause for revolution likely to occur under a Republican Administration. We are engaged in no new transaction, not even in a new dispute. Our fathers undertook a great work for themselves, for us, and for our successors—to erect a free and federal empire, whose arches shall span the North American continent, and reflect the rays of the sun throughout his whole passage from one to the other of the great oceans. They erected thirteen of its columns all at once. These are standing now, the admiration of mankind. Their successors added twenty more; even we who are here have shaped and elevated three of that twenty, and all these are as firm and as steadfast as the first thirteen; and more will yet be necessary when we shall have rested from our labors. Some among us prefer for these columns a composite material; others a pure white marble. Our fathers and our predecessors differed in the same way, and on the same point. What execrations should we not all unite in pronouncing on any statesman who heretofore, from mere disappointment and disgust at being overruled in his choice of materials, for any new column then to be quarried, should have laid violent hands on the imperfect structure, and brought it down to the earth, there to remain a wreck, instead of a citadel of a world's best hopes!

I remain now in the opinion I have uniformly expressed here and elsewhere, that these hasty threats of Disunion are so unnatural that they will find no hand to execute them. We are of one race, language, liberty and faith; engaged, indeed, in varied industry, but even that industry so diversified, brings us into more intimate relations with each other than any other people, however homogenous, and though living under a consolidated government, ever maintained. We languish throughout, if one joint of our Federal frame is smitten; while it is certain that a part dissevered must perish. You may refine as you please about the structure of the Government, and say that it is a compact, and that a breach, by one of the States or by Congress, or any one article, absolves all the members from allegiance, and that the States may separate when they have, or fancy they have cause for war. But once try to subvert it, and you will find that it is a Government of the whole people—as individuals, as well as a compact of States; that every individual member of the body politic is conscious of his interest and power in it, and knows that he will be helpless, powerless, hopeless, when it shall have gone down. Mankind have a natural right, a natural instinct, and a natural capacity for self-government; and when, as here they are sufficiently ripened by culture, they will and must have self-government, and no other.—The framers of our Constitution, with a wisdom that surpassed all previous understanding among men, adapted it to these inherent elements of human nature. He strangely, blindly misunderstands the anatomy of the great system, who thinks that its only bonds, or even its strongest ligaments, are the written compact or the multiplied and thoroughly ramified roads and thoroughfares of trade, commerce and social intercourse. These are strong, indeed, but its chiefest instruments of cohesion—those which render it inseparable and indivisible—are the millions of fibres of millions of contented, happy human hearts, binding by their affections, their ambition and their best hopes equally the high and low, the rich and the poor, the wise and unwise, the learned and untutored, even the good and the bad, to a Government, the first, the last, and the only such one that has ever existed, which takes equal heed always of their wants, their wishes and their opinions; and appeals to them all, individually, once in a year, or in two years, or at least in four years, for their expressed consent and renewal, without which it must cease. No, go where you will, and to what class you may, with commissions for your fatal service in one hand, and your bounty counted by the hundred or the thousand pieces of silver in the other, a thousand resisters will rise up for every recruit you can engage. On the banks equally of the St. Lawrence and the Rio Grande, on the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts, on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, and in the dells of the Rocky Mountains, among the fishermen of the banks of Newfoundland, the weavers and spinners of Massachusetts, the stevedores of New York, the miners of Pennsylvania, Pike's Peak and California, the wheat-growers of Indiana, the cotton and sugar planters on the Mississippi, among the voluntary citizens from every other land not less than the native born, the Christian and the Jew,

among the Indians on the prairies, the contumacious Mormons in the Deseret, the Africans free, the Africans in bondage, the inmates of hospitals and almshouses, and even the criminals in the penitentiaries, rehearse the story of your wrongs and their own never so eloquently and never so mournfully, and appeal to them to rise. They will ask you, "Is this all?" "Are you more just than Washington, wiser than Hamilton, more humane than Jefferson?" "What new form of Government or of Union have you the power to establish, or even the cunning to devise, that will be more just, more safe, more free, more gentle, more beneficent, or more glorious than this?" And by these simple interrogatories you will be silenced and confounded.

Mr. President, we are perpetually forgetting this subtle and complex, yet obvious and natural, mechanism of our Constitution; and because we do forget it, we are continually wondering how it is that a confederacy of thirty and more States, covering regions so vast, and regulating interests so various of so many millions of men, constituted and conditioned so diversely, works right on. We are continually looking to see it stop and stand still, and fall suddenly into pieces. But, in truth, it will not stop; it cannot stop; it was made not to stop, but to keep in motion—in motion always, and without force. For my own part, as this wonderful machine, when it had newly come from the hands of its almost divine inventors, was the admiration of my earlier years, although it was then but imperfectly known abroad, so now, when it forms the central figure in the economy of the world's civilization, and the best sympathies of mankind favor its continuance, I expect that it will stand and work right on until men shall fear its failure no more than we now apprehend that the sun will cease to hold its eternal place in the heavens.

Nevertheless, I do not expect to see this purely popular, though majestic system always working on unattended by the presence and exhibition of human temper and human passions. That would be to expect to enjoy rewards, benefits, and blessings without labor, care, and watchfulness—an expectation contrary to Divine appointment. These are the discipline of the American citizen, and he must inure himself to it. When, as now, a great policy, fastened upon the country through its doubts and fears, confirmed by its habits, and strengthened by personal interests and ambitions, is to be relaxed and changed, in order that the nation may have its just, and natural, and free developments, then, indeed, all the winds of controversy are let loose upon us from all points of the political compass, we see objects and men only through political hazes, mists, and doubtful and lurid lights. The earth seems to be heaving under our feet, and the pillars of the noble fabric that protects us to be trembling before our eyes. But the appointed end of all this agitation comes at last, and always seasonably; the tumults of the people subside; the country becomes calm once more; and then we find that only our senses have been disturbed, and that they have betrayed us. The earth is firm as always before, and the wonderful structure, for whose safety we have feared so anxiously, now more firmly fixed than ever, still stands unmoved, enduring and immovable.

DEMOCRATIC LEADERS FOR DISUNION.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY WILSON,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

Delivered in the Senate of the United States, January 25, 1860.

THE Senate proceeded to consider the following resolutions, submitted by Mr. BROWN on the 18th instant:

Resolved, That the Territories are the common property of all the States, and that it is the privilege of the citizens of all the States to go into the Territories with every kind or description of property recognized by the Constitution of the United States, and held under the laws of any of the States; and that it is the constitutional duty of the lawmaking power, wherever lodged or by whomsoever exercised, whether by the Congress or Territorial Legislature, to enact such laws as may be found necessary for the adequate and sufficient protection of such property.

Resolved, That the Committee on Territories be instructed to insert, in any bill they may report for the organization of new Territories, a clause declaring it to be the duty of the Territorial Legislature to enact adequate and sufficient laws for the protection of all kinds of property, as above described, within the limits of the Territory; and that, upon its failure or refusal to do so, it is the admitted duty of Congress to interfere and pass such laws.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, when the Republic entered the family of nations, it proclaimed to kings and princes, to nobles and privileged classes, to toiling freemen and lowly bondmen, the equality of man. Passing now through the eighty-fourth year of national life, America presents to the gaze of nations the humiliating and saddening spectacle of a Republic, which began its independent existence by the promulgation of a bill of rights as old as creation and as wide as humanity, distracted by discordant and angry discussions upon issues growing out of the bondage of four million men.

Slavery in America—our connections with it, and relations to it, the obligations these connections and relations impose upon us as men, as citizens of the States and of the United States make the issues of the age, the transcendent magnitude of which command the profoundest attention of the country. In the crowded city and the lonely dwelling, the public press and the judicial tribunal, the hall of legislation and the temple of the living God—everywhere—goes on the "irrepressible conflict" between the sublime creed of the charter of independence and the aggressive spirit of slavery; between the institutions of freedom our fathers founded and the system of human bondage which now darkens the land, casting its baleful shadows over the Republic, obscuring its lustre and marring its symmetry and beauty.

Within fifteen States of this Democratic Republic, which commenced its career by uttering the ideas of equality and liberty that live in the throbbing hearts of the toiling masses, and nurse even the wavering hopes of hapless bondmen amid the thick gloom of rayless oppression, more than four million human beings, made in the image of God, are held in perpetual bondage. By inexorable laws, sanctioned by the merciless force of public opinion, these millions are denied the rights of manhood, and degraded to the abject condition of chattelhood. To them, the hallowed relations of husband and wife, parent and child, are held, not by the sacred rights of a common humanity, but by the will of masters. The laws, the customs, the public opinion, which have sunk these millions from the dignity of humanity down to the degradation of chattels, have founded and developed a privileged class, which now controls the slaveholding States. This class now rules these fifteen States, abrogating, in support of its interests, the inborn, inbred, constitutional right of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. In these States, the power of this class is overshadowing, resistless, complete.

Over the Federal Government this class, this slave power, has achieved complete dominion. The slave power this day holds the National Government, in all its departments, in absolute subjugation. In this chamber, where sit the representatives of sovereign commonwealths, that power retains unbroken sway. That power bids the Supreme Court utter its decrees, and that high tribunal obeys its imperative commands. That power holds the President in the hollow of its hand, compelling him to declare that "slavery exists in Kansas by virtue of the Constitution;" that "the master has the right to take his slave into the territories as property, and have it protected there under the Federal Constitution;" that "neither Congress nor the Territorial Legislature, nor any human power, has any authority to annul or impair this vested right." That power summoned the aspiring Vice-President to his own Kentucky, to give his assurances "that this constitutional right exists;" that "we must hold to this principle, we must stand by it;" and "if it cannot be enforced for want of proper legislation to enforce it, sufficient legislation must be passed, or our Government is a failure." That power lays its iron hand upon the representatives of free and proud commonwealths, in this chamber and in the other, compelling them to disavow their own recorded opinions, to accept the monstrous dogma, that "neither Congress, nor a Territorial Legislature, nor any human power, has any authority to annul or impair the vested right" of the master to have his slave protected as property in the Territories under the Federal Constitution. Well might the Vice-President, in view of the recent triumphs and the imperial sway of the slave power, proudly say to the men of his native Kentucky, "We stand in a good position!" "We have the Executive; we have the laws; we have the courts; and that is a great advance from where we stood ten years ago."

The glowing pages of that history which records the deeds of the heroic men who, in defence of the inherent and indefeasible rights of humanity, accepted the bloody issues of civil war, and defied and baffled the gigantic power of the British Empire, won national independence, and framed a Constitution for united America, bear to us of this generation the amplest evidences that they, with rare exceptions, believed slavery to be a local and temporary evil, which British avarice planted and British power nurtured in America, and which the advancing current of a humane and Christian civilization would sweep from the land it stained and polluted. But seventy years, Mr. President, have now passed away since the inauguration of the Government under the Federal Constitution. That six hundred thousand bondmen, valued at less than fifty million dollars, have increased to four million, valued at more than two thousand million. That feeble system of African slavery, which seemed to the hopeful eyes of our patriotic fathers smitten with the disease of original sin, has expanded into a gigantic system, which now casts its chilling influences over the land, polluting the very sources of national life, perverting the moral sense of the nation, corrupting the sentiment of justice, humanity and liberty, and leaving the traces of its ruinous power upon the institutions and upon the soil of the Republic, which it turns to barrenness and desolation.

Sir, this expansion and growth of the system of African slavery, this development of the slave power, during the past seventy years, have wrought a wonderful change, a complete revolution, in the sentiments and opinions of the public men who control the councils of America. What a contrast between slavery in America in 1789, and slavery in America in 1860! Then, it was weak; now, it is strong. Then, its influ-

☞FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF THE ALBANY EVENING JOURNAL. PRICE, PER SINGLE COPY, 2c.; PER DOZEN COPIES, 20c.; PER HUNDRED, $1; PER THOUSAND, $8.

nces over the nation were impotent; now, it holds the Government in its iron grasp. Then, the public men who dictated the policy of the Government deemed it to be a moral, social and political evil, which humanity and religion deplored; now, it is regarded by the men who control the Government as a positive good, a beneficent system, "a great moral," in the words of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Brown], "social and political blessing—a blessing to the master and a blessing to the slave." Then, to prohibit it in the Territories was deemed alike the right and duty of the Government; now, the avowed doctrine of the Administration of the Government is, that the slaveholders have the right to carry their slaves as property into the Territories, and hold them there as property by virtue of the Constitution, and that "neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature, nor any human power, has authority to annul or impair this vested right." Then, to cherish, as a living faith, the creed "that all men are created equal;" to believe slavery to be an evil; to believe, with Henry, that "a time would come to abolish this lamentable evil;" and with Jefferson, that "nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate, than that this people shall be free," brought neither proscription from power nor indignities from the people; now, these sentiments bring upon the public man the proscriptions of power, the ridicule and reproach of presses in the interest of power, and subject the American citizen, whose rights are guarded by constitutional guaranties, in the slave States to the insults and degrading indignities of lawless and brutal mobs, maddened by the fanaticism of slavery, to arrests, imprisonments, fines, and banishments. Then, the people of America confided their new Government to the guardianship and guidance of statesmen known by their acts and recorded opinions to be unalterably opposed to the slave trade, to the perpetuity of slavery, to its expansion into the vast empire of the Northwest; now, the public men of America, who inherit the sentiments and opinions of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Adams, Jay, Hamilton, and their illustrious compeers, who would consecrate the territorial possessions of the Republic to free institutions for all, are admonished, in these chambers, that they will not be permitted, in the slave States, to avow their sentiments, or to advocate the election to the Presidency, in 1860, of a candidate representing their policy; aye that the election of such a candidate will be the cause for the dissolution of the Union.

In the month of August, 1620, twenty African bondmen were borne into the waters of Virginia. At Jamestown, in 1620, began that system of human slavery in America, which now, in 1860, haughtily assumes to mould and fashion the policy of the nation; to expand itself over the vast possessions of the Republic; to repress the inborn right of the freedom of speech and of the press; to arrest and to imprison, to scourge and to banish American citizens for entertaining, cherishing and uttering the sentiments of the great statesmen of the North and of the South, who carried us through the fire and blood of the Revolution—statesmen whose names are forever associated with national independence and constitutional freedom.

This system of African slavery, planted on the shores of Virginia, grew and spread over America under the colonial and commercial policy of England. Encouraged by British legislation, and fostered by royal favor, the merchants of England transported from the shores of western Africa, to the thirteen British colonies, from the middle of the seventeenth century to 1776, more than three hundred thousand of the children of Africa. The coffers of her merchants were filled with gold soiled with the blood of these hapless bondmen. For nearly two centuries the party of the slave trade controlled the Government, and directed the policy of England. Kings and queens, lords and commons, judges and attorneys-general and bishops, all gave to the traffic in the bodies of men their persistent support. Parliament pronounced "the trade highly advantageous to the kingdom and its colonies." Queen Anne instructed the Governor of New York and New Jersey "to give due encouragement to the Royal African Company." The merchants and manufacturers clamored for the extension and protection of the African slave traffic; and when the charter of the Royal African Company expired in 1749, the ports of Africa, for thirty degrees, from Cape Blanco to Loango St. Paul's, were thrown open to the free competition of British commerce. Under this colonial and commercial policy of England, the traffic in the bodies of men, between the coasts of Africa and the Spanish, French and British colonies in the western world, expanded into gigantic proportions, and slavery spread and increased with such fearful rapidity, that the American colonies were startled and appalled; and "laws designed to restrict importations of slaves," says Bancroft, "are scattered along the records of colonial legislation." To check their importation, Virginia imposed a tax; but "the African Company obtained the repeal of the law." "The British Government," says Madison, "constantly checked the attempts of Virginia to put a stop to this *infernal traffic*." Oglethorpe, the founder of Georgia, forbade slavery; but "the merchants got the Government to sanction slavery there." Even South Carolina, for attempting to restrict the slave traffic, received the rebuke of the British Government, which steadily and relentlessly resisted all colonial action tending to check the inhuman traffic in the souls and bodies of men. Up to the hour of national independence, the Government of England sternly rejected all colonial restrictions upon slavery and the slave trade, and persisted in the policy of forcing that trade upon all her colonies, which were "not allowed," in the words of the Earl of Dartmouth, 1775, "to check or discourage, in any degree, a traffic so beneficial to the nation." British avarice planted slavery in America; British legislation nurtured and sustained it; and British statesmen sanctioned and guarded it.

In spite, however, of the avarice of the men who guided the commercial and colonial policy of England, spite of the potent influences of the statesmen who swayed the councils of the Throne, the slave trade and slavery found sturdy opponents in England and America. In the middle of the eighteenth century, years before Granville Sharpe brought James Somerset before the King's Bench—twenty years before Lord Mansfield pronounced that immortal opinion, which reversed the joint opinion of York and Talbot that "a slave coming into Great Britain doth not become free," and made it forever impossible for slaves to breathe the air of England—John Woolman traversed America, proclaiming to Christian men that "the practice of continuing men in slavery was not right;" that "liberty was the natural right of all men equally." This early apostle of emancipation found many slave masters on the banks of the Hudson, the Delaware and the Potomac, who encouraged the emancipation of the bondmen, "because they had no contract for their labor, and liberty was their right." During the years of agitation and discussion, from the treaty of Paris in 1762 to the opening dawn of the Revolution at Lexington—years, during which the rights of the colonies and the rights of man were discussed with masterly power by the most gifted minds of America, the popular leaders in New England, the middle colonies and Virginia, did not fail to see and to acknowledge the wrongfulness of slavery, and to denounce the slave traffic and the slavery-extending policy of the British Government. The records of those days of trial and of glory will bear to all coming time the amplest evidence that the men who inaugurated the Revolution, carried America from colonial dependence to national independence, were not only hostile to the slave trade, but to the perpetual existence of slavery itself.

When the first Congress assembled, in 1774, the humanity of the colonies, long repressed and baffled by the power of England, found utterance. That assemblage of illustrious men declared that "God never intended a part of the human race to hold property in, and unbounded power over, others;" that they "would not import slaves, or buy slaves imported by others." These illustrious statesmen framed the articles of association which united the colonies in one federative Union. By the second article of that bond of union, the slave trade was prohibited; and that prohibition of the inhuman traffic in man was sustained by the men of the North and the men of the South, and by the colonies of the North and of the South. Thus did the slave trade, which Jefferson afterward, in the original draft of the Declaration, branded as an "execrable commerce," a "piratical warfare," receive the condemnation of the men who accepted the bloody issues of civil war in defence of their periled liberties.

When the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed, nearly half a million of men were held in bondage in America. Influenced by the rising spirit of liberty, by the awakened sense of the natural rights of man, which had found utterance in the charter of independence, the Northern States early adopted measures tending to emancipation. Nor were efforts for the emancipation of the bondmen confined to the Northern States. Jefferson and Wythe, commissioned to revise the laws of Virginia, after the peace of 1783, prepared a plan of gradual emancipation; but timid counsels prevailed, and the Old Dominion failed to take her place in the list of free commonwealths. Timidity, the sordid spirit of gain, the lust and pride of the privileged class—not the humane sentiments of Washington and Henry, Jefferson and Wythe, Mason and Randolph—controlled the policy of that great State. But Mr. Jefferson, in a letter to Dr. Price, of England, in 1785, thus spoke of the cause of emancipation in Virginia:

"This is the next State to which we may turn our eyes for the interesting spectacle of *justice in conflict with avarice and oppression*—a conflict wherein the sacred side is daily gaining recruits, from the influx into office of young men grown up and growing up. These have sucked in the principles of liberty, as it were, with their mothers' milk; and it is to them I look with anxiety to turn the fate of the question."

When the Convention assembled in May, 1787, to frame the Constitution of the United States, Massachusetts was a free commonwealth. The foot of the slave no longer pressed the rock of Plymouth, nor the hallowed sods of Lexington, Concord or Bunker Hill. Other Northern States had taken measures for ultimate emancipation; but slavery, in its modified form, still lingered in the North. In the whole country, nearly six hundred thousand human beings were held in servitude; but these bondmen were only estimated at the average value of eighty dollars each; and Elbridge Gerry estimated the whole value of the slaves at that time, south of the Potomac, at $10,000,000. Slavery existed in each of the States by the mere force of the laws, usages and regulations of the people of each State where it was recognized as a mere local institution.

In that assemblage of illustrious statesmen, met to frame a Constitution for a free people, were men whose wisdom in council and valor in the field had carried the country through the fire of a revolutionary war. The baptism of freedom was on their brows, and its spirit burned in their bosoms. Over that assemblage of statesmen presided the peerless Washington, who "wished as much as any man living to see slavery abolished by legislative authority," and to "accomplish it by the only proper and effective mode," his "suffrage should never be wanting." Franklin regarded slavery as an "atrocious debasement of human nature," and he was prepared to "step to the verge of vested power to discourage every species of traffic in the bodies of our fellow men." Madison, whose name is forever associated with the Constitution of the United States, pronounced slavery "a dreadful calamity," and he "thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man." Gouverneur Morris, whose hand was to give the finishing form to the work of the Convention, denounced slavery as "a nefarious institution." Luther Martin believed that "God was Lord of all, viewing with equal eye the poor African slave and his American master;" and he would "authorize the General Government to make such regulations as should be most advantageous for the gradual abolition of slavery and the emancipation of the slaves which were already in the States." Elbridge Gerry "would leave slavery to be dealt with by the States, but he would give no sanction to it." Oliver Ellsworth believed "slavery would soon be only a speck in the country." George Mason declared that slavery produced "the most pernicious effects on manners;" that "every master of slaves is born a

petty tyrant;" that "it brought the curse of Heaven on a country." Roger Sherman "would not tax slaves, because it would imply that they were property." Rufus King would by law enact that "slavery shall be forever prohibited" in the western Territories." Alexander Hamilton, James Wilson, Robert Morris, and other statesmen, whose names are imperishably associated with the constitutional history of the Republic, have left in the records of the country their sentiments of hostility to slavery. The framers of the Constitution, like the members of the first Congress, who branded the slave trade; the members of the Congress of 1776, who declared that "all men are created equal;" and the members of the Congress of 1787, who stamped the words "slavery shall be and is forever prohibited" on every foot of the territory northwest of the Ohio, were hostile to the traffic in men, to the extension of slavery, and to its perpetuity in America.

But there came into that Convention the representatives of a small but powerful class, which clung, in South Carolina and Georgia, with relentless tenacity to the British slave-trading and slave-extending and slave-perpetuating policy. In "complaisance to this class in South Carolina and Georgia," the signers of the Declaration of Independence had erased from the original draft of Jefferson the arraignment of the British monarch for "waging cruel war against human nature itself," "violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people, who never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere." This class had broken the second article of the association of union, which prohibited the importation and the traffic in slaves; and in that time of trial and of anxiety, when the men who had met undismayed the power of England on the perilous ridges of battle, trembled for the future of their country, the representatives of this slaveholding class of the extreme south came into that council of patriotic statesmen, ready to peril the unity of the Republic, unless they could wring from the Convention the power to continue the inhuman, loathsome, and polluted traffic in the muscles and bones of men—a traffic which Jefferson branded as an "execrable commerce," and Madison pronounced "infernal." To silence the clamorous demands of the Rutledges and Pinckneys, the Butlers and Baldwins—the representatives of this class—the Convention made a compromise, by which they permitted the slave trade to continue for twenty years longer, unchecked by national legislation, three-fifths of the slaves to be represented in the House, and a provision to be incorporated into the Constitution for the rendition of persons owing service or labor in one State escaping into another. These concessions were wrung from the Convention, not by the power of the slaveholding class, but by its weakness, rather—by the fatal confidence of the statesmen of that day, that slavery would soon pass away under the influence of the ideas they had proclaimed and the institutions they had founded. The slave representation and the clause concerning fugitives from labor were then regarded as questions of little practical importance, while the authority wholly to extinguish the slave traffic after 1808, and the inhibition of slavery by the ordinance of 1787 in the Northwest, were deemed fatal to the expansion and development of slavery and its malign influences.

The organization of the Federal Government, under the Constitution, demonstrated the impotency of the slave perpetuists and the anti slavery sentiment of the people. Washington was unanimously borne into the Presidency, and he had avowed it to be "among his *first wishes* to see some plan adopted by which slavery in this country may be abolished by law." Adams was made Vice-President, and he held that "consenting to slavery is a sacrilegious breach of trust." Jefferson was made Secretary of State, and he had declared that "the abolition of domestic slavery was the greatest object of desire;" that "the whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other"—that "the statesman should be loaded with execration who, permitting one-half the citizens to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part, and the *amor patriæ* of the other; that he "trembled for his country when he reflected that God was just; that his justice cannot sleep forever;" that "the Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest." Hamilton was placed at the head of the Treasury, and he was a member of an anti-slavery society in New York, where he united in a petition for the emancipation of those who, "free by the laws of God, are held in slavery by the laws of the State." Jay was made Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and he believed slavery to be an "iniquity"—"a sin of crimson dye," and that "our prayers to Heaven would be impious until we abolished it." And from the presidency of an abolition society, this pure and stainless character was summoned by Washington to preside over that highest judicial tribunal. Gouverneur Morris believed that "slavery brought the curse of Heaven upon a country," and Washington sent him to represent his government at the Court of France. Madison, Gerry, Langdon, King, Ellsworth, Sherman, Robert Morris, and other renowned statesmen, whose anti-slavery sentiments were recorded in the history of the country, held seats in the Senate and House of Representatives. Those patriotic statesmen, into whose keeping the American people intrusted the new formed Government, were committed—fully committed—against the slave traffic, the extension of slavery, and for the ultimate emancipation of slavery in all America.

The foremost men of that day, not in the national councils, were equally committed against the slave system. They saw what Washington saw and expressed, "*the direful effects of slavery.*" Patrick Henry declared that "it would rejoice his *very soul*, that every one of his fellow-beings was emancipated;" that he "believed the time would come to abolish this lamentable evil;" that he "would transmit to their descendants, together with their slaves, a pity for their unhappy lot, and an abhorrence of slavery." James Iredell, soon to be summoned by Washington to the bench of the Supreme Court, in the Convention of North Carolina, avowed that, "when the entire abolition of slavery takes place, it will be an event which must be pleasing to every generous mind, and every friend of human nature." The great Maryland lawyer, Luther Martin, declared "slavery is inconsistent with the genius of republicanism, and has a tendency to destroy those principles on which it is supported, as it *lessens the sense of the equal rights of mankind, and habituates us to tyranny and oppression.* William Pinckney also declared, that "nothing is more clear, than that the effect of *slavery* is to destroy that REVERENCE FOR LIBERTY which is THE VITAL PRINCIPLE OF A REPUBLIC;" that "the dreary system of partial bondage is iniquitous and most dishonorable to Maryland; that, "by the *eternal principles of natural justice, no master has a right to hold his slave in bondage a single hour.*" And this great jurist uttered these prophetic words, which we see fulfilled in this age: "If slavery continues fifty years longer, *its effects will be seen in the decay of the spirit of liberty in the free States.*"

The enduring records of the Republic will carry down to after ages the sentiments of hostility to human bondage, uttered by the men who, in defense of periled liberty, defied the power of the British Empire, and gave independence to the North American Republic. The history of that age is radiant with the glowing thoughts and burning words against African slavery, which British avarice planted on the virgin soil of the western world. Under their inspiring words, emancipation societies sprang into being in the South and in the North, and the noblest names that grace the pages of our history were enrolled upon the records of these societies. A national anti-slavery society was organized, and the highest hopes of the patriot, the philanthropist, and the Christian, seemed in process of realization. Colored freemen, many of whom had periled their lives on the stricken fields of the Revolution, were allowed the rights of citizenship in some of the States. In Maryland and North Carolina they possessed this right, and young Tennessee, in 1796, came into the Union with a Constitution which permitted free colored men to exercise that high right of citizenship. In New York, Chancellor Robert R. Livingston, one of the foremost men of his age in America, reported against a bill referred to him for the gradual abolition of slavery, because it did not give to the emancipated bondmen the full rights of citizenship and the right of suffrage; for they "could not," he said, "be deprived of these essential rights without shocking the principles of equal liberty, and laying the foundation of an aristocracy of the most dangerous and malignant kind, rendering power permanent and hereditary in the hands of those persons who declare their origin through white ancestors only." Such were the liberal sentiments of a statesman of exalted character and large and varied experiences, who acted as a member of the committee to draft the Declaration of Independence, and as Secretary of Foreign Affairs under the Confederation: who administered the oath of office to the first President, and negotiated the treaty for the acquisition of Louisiana.

That slave power now compels public men, nurtured and reared amidst the influences of free institutions, to hasten with alacrity to disavow past sentiments and opinions, to accept the dogmas of the slave propaganda, and to join in hunting down old comrades. That power has established in the slave States a relentless despotism over the freedom of speech and of the press, and of correspondence through the mails. That power will not permit American citizens to entertain, utter, print, or circulate, sentiments and opinions concerning slavery which were avowed by Jefferson, Henry, Mason and the great men of Virginia of the Revolutionary era, or even by McDowell, Summers, and Randolph, in the Convention of 1830. The American citizen, living under a Constitution which guarantees free speech, holds that right subject to arbitrary laws or to the lawless acts of brutal mobs. George Fitzhugh, one of the apostles of slavery, the author of a work on "THE FAILURE OF FREE SOCIETY," in which he avows the doctrine that 'slavery, BLACK OR WHITE, is right and necessary, now declares, with regard to the "right of private judgment, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion," that "the South takes care to trammel these sterner rights (so called) quite as efficiently, by an austere public opinion, as Louis Napoleon does by law, or by mere volition;" that "we propose to deter men from applying the axe to the root of our southern institutions (that is, by discussions or recurring to 'fundamental principles'), first by moral suasion or monition, next by tar and feathers, and, that failing, by the halter."

Sir, what a humiliating spectacle does the Republic now present to the gaze of mankind! I speak not of the millions of beings sunk from the lofty level of a common humanity down to the abject submission of unreasoning beasts of burden, nor of the laws that shrivel the mind and debase the soul of the bondman; but I speak of the deeds of lawlessness and inhumanity against free American citizens—deeds which shock every manly bosom. The mails daily bring us intelligence of the lawless deeds of brutal mobs, of the indignities perpetrated upon freemen guilty of no crime, unless it be a crime, in 1860, to cling to the opinions of the fathers of the Republic. The Post-Office Department, the Postmaster-General tells us, "pervades every channel of commerce, and every theatre of human enterprise; and while visiting, as it does kindly, every fireside, mingles with the throbbings of almost every heart in the land. In the amplitude of its beneficence, it ministers to all climes and creeds and pursuits, with the same eager readiness and with equal fullness of fidelity." This Post-Office Department, in nearly half the States, is at the mercy of the stupidity or prejudice of postmasters, maddened by slavery fanaticism, and the correspondence of the people and the public journals may be examined, seized and destroyed by these censors of despotism; and this may be, and is done under the open sanction of the Administration. Families are banished from their hearths and homes. Free colored men are forced to break the holy ties of kindred, seek homes among strangers, or be doomed to perpetual slavery, by laws which "propose," in the words of Judge Catron, of the Supreme Court, "*to commit an outrage—to perpetrate an oppression and cruelty.*" Surely there is no country in Christendom—no, not one—where the freemen of the United States are exposed to such insults, such indignities, such lawless oppressions, as in

the slaveholding States of this Democratic Republic. The President calls our attention to the outrages perpetrated upon American citizens in Mexico. There is, sir, more security for the citizens of Massachusetts, for the eighteen million people of the North, in revolutionary Mexico, rent and torn by civil war, than in the slaveholding States. More insults, indignities and outrages have been heaped upon freemen in the slave States, during the past one hundred days, than have been perpetrated upon American citizens in Mexico during all the changes, and revolutions, and civil strifes which have marked the forty years of her independent existence.

Mr. President, the statesmen of the South, in this chamber and in the other wing of the capitol, frankly admit that a revolution concerning slavery has been wrought in the public sentiment of the slaveholding States. This admitted revolution in the sentiments of the people of the South has wrought the change in the policy of the slave States and of the national Government now so unmistakably manifest. How did the slaveholding class—a mere handful of men in this nation of twenty-six million freemen—work this change in the policy of the nation—a change which the sense of justice, the love of liberty, the humane and Christian sentiments of the age condemn? How did this small, and, so far as numbers are concerned, insignificant class of slaveholders achieve over the councils of Republican America an influence so potential?

This slaveholding class, which shapes and fashions at its pleasure the policy of the General Government, was borne into power by the Democratic party; and it is this day upheld in power by the Democratic party. Acquiring the ascendency in the Democratic party, this privileged class has imposed its hateful dogmas upon that party, compelling it to carry its flag, to fight its battles, and to bear the crushing burden of its crimes against the rights of human nature. Democrats of the free States, men born under the inspiring influences of free institutions, taught in free schools, instructed in free churches, have, during the last fifteen years, borne the banners of slavery extension, and often ingloriously fallen under the consuming wrath of a betrayed and indignant people. The Democracy of the North is as much the instrument of the Slave Power for extending, upholding and perpetuating human slavery in America, as is the army of the Emperor of Austria in maintaining his despotic rule in Hungary and Venetia.

Sir, when the army returned from Mexico, bringing with it the title deeds to half a million square miles of free soil, the people of the free States desired it to be consecrated forever to freedom and free institutions. The Democracy of the North, obedient to the popular will, gave their support to the policy of slave prohibition; but the Slave Power imperiously demanded the abandonment of the principle of slave inhibition, and Democracy obeyed the peremptory mandate, abandoned the Jefferson proviso, and organized Utah and New Mexico without any guaranties for freedom. The Slave Power, in the hour of its triumph in its territorial policy, required a new fugitive slave law; and the northern Democracy consented to the enactment of a law which violated every legal guaranty of freemen, shocked the sense of justice and put in jeopardy the liberties of freemen, of which the legal rights of the poorest and humblest outweigh the interests of every slaveholder in America. In 1854, the slave propagandists demanded the repeal of the prohibition of slavery in Kansas and Nebraska; and the Democracy, in complaisance to the slave power, repealed that prohibition. Five thousand armed men of Missouri marched into Kansas, seized the ballot-boxes, elected a Territorial Legislature, planted slavery, enacted inhuman and unchristian laws for its support. The slave power demanded the enforcement of those arbitrary enactments by the General Government, and President Pierce upheld them with the bayonets of the army; and in this he was supported by the Democracy of the North. The slave power demanded that Governor Walker and Secretary Stanton should be removed for exposing the pro-slavery frauds of the October election of 1857; and President Buchanan forced Walker to resign, and removed Stanton, who would not bend; and the Democracy of the North upheld the action of the President.

To crown the long series of outrages upon the people of Kansas, the slave power demanded that Congress should force the Lecompton Constitution, the product of fraud and violence, upon an unwilling and protesting people; and the Democracy of the North, with a few exceptions, responded to that infamous demand. The slave power requires the abandonment of the doctrine, that the people of a Territory can legislate against slavery, and the acceptance of the dogma that the Constitution protects slavery as property in the Territories; and the leaders of the Democracy of the North in this chamber, with two or three exceptions, accept this new creed, which makes every foot of the Territories of the Republic slave soil. The acknowledged chiefs of the slave power are demanding a national slave code for the Territories; and already the aspiring leaders of the Democracy of the North are hastening to give assurances that they are prepared to acquiesce in that extraordinary demand. The chiefs of the slave propaganda are turning their lustful eyes to Cuba, Central America, and Mexico, for territory in which to plant slavery; for they hold, that in whatever territory acquired, or to be acquired, the flag of the Union waves, slavery for the African, and not freedom for all men, is inscribed on its folds. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Brown], one of the acknowledged leaders of the slaveholding class, declares to his constituents, with the frankness that marks his character:

"*I want Cuba;* I want Tamaulipas, Potosi, and one or two other Mexican States; and *I want them all for the same reason—for the planting and spreading of slavery.* And a footing in Central America will powerfully aid us in acquiring those other States. Yes; *I want these countries for the spread of slavery.* I would spread the blessings of slavery, *like the religion of our Divine Master*, to the uttermost ends of the earth; and, rebellious and wicked as the Yankees have been, *I would even extend it to them.*"

These dreams of empires in which to plant slavery fill the minds of the leaders of the slave propaganda; and the President, in asking authority to march the army into Mexico, and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. SLIDELL], in pressing his Cuba scheme, are acting in response to these ideas of conquest and acquisition. Up to this hour, the slave propagandists have never made a requisition upon the Northern Democrats which has not been complied with, although many of them have sealed their ready servility with political martyrdom.

Sir, to arrest the aggressive policy of the slave propaganda, which is perverting the Constitution, subverting the institutions, disturbing the repose of the country, endangering the stability of the Union, and bringing reproach upon the American name: and to restore the Government to the policy of its illustrious founders, an organization has been formed which calls itself the Republican party. This party, which embraces in its organization a million and a half of intelligent and patriotic freemen, proclaims no new doctrine; it proposes no new experiments. Upon the great and overshadowing question of slavery in America, the Republican party accepts the doctrines of the Revolutionary fathers, of the North and of the South. The Republican party sees, as Washington saw, "*the direful effects of slavery*;" it believes, with Henry, that "*slavery is a lamentable evil*;" with Luther Martin, that "*slavery is inconsistent with the genius of Republicanism*;" with Madison, that "*slavery is a dreadful calamity*;" that "*imbecility is ever attendant upon a country filled with slaves*;" with Monroe, that "*slavery has preyed upon the very vitals of the Union, and has been prejudicial to all the States in which it has existed.*" Concurring in these opinions of these illustrious patriots and statesmen of the South, the Republican party proposes to preserve the vast territorial possessions of the Republic from "the direful effects" of this "dreadful calamity" which "has preyed upon the vitals of the Union," by applying to, and engraving upon, those Territorial possessions these words, "*slavery shall be* AND IS FOREVER *prohibited*;" words which came from the pen of Jefferson, were embodied in the ordinance of 1787, and stamped on every foot of the virgin sods of the Northwest."

Believing freedom to be national, and slavery to be local and sectional, "a mere municipal regulation," in the words of the Supreme Court, "founded upon and limited to the verge of the State law," for which the people of each State that tolerates it are alone responsible, the Republican party joins issue with the sectionalized Democracy, which, under the lead of men whose vital and animating principle is the propagation of slavery, accepts the monstrous dogma that slavery by virtue of the Constitution, exists in all the Territories. Accepting this doctrine, the Democracy repealed the prohibition of slavery in Kansas and Nebraska, and resists all Congressional action. Accepting this doctrine, the Democracy in those Territories resists Territorial acts to prohibit slavery, and Government officials veto their enactments. Accepting this doctrine, the Democratic Legislature of New Mexico, under the lead of Democratic Government officials, prompted by Mr. OTERO, the Democratic Delegate, "at the solicitation of General R. DAVIS, of Mississippi," have enacted a brutal and bloody slave code. Already the Democratic chiefs of the slave power are demanding the enactment of a slave code by Congress, and the leaders of the Democracy are hastening to give them assurances that "if," in the words of the Vice-President, "this constitutional right to hold slaves as property in the Territories cannot be enforced for want of proper legislation to enforce it, sufficient legislation must be passed, or our Government is a failure."

Rejecting the dogmas accepted by the Democracy, and holding, with the Republican fathers, that slavery cannot exist in the Territories except by positive law, and that Congress and the people of the Territories may exclude it, the Republican party takes issue with the national Democracy, and appeals to the intelligent patriotism of the country. It appeals, not to the local and temporary interests of sections, but to the lasting interests of the whole country; not to the passions and pride of classes, but to the sober judgment, the sense of justice, the love of liberty, and the humane and Christian sentiments of all classes.

Sir, in the progress of the contests of the past six years between the interests of slave labor and the rights of free labor in the infant empires we are creating in the West, the power of the northern Democracy has been broken, and its leaders have ingloriously fallen. Falling in the great battle of "JUSTICE IN CONFLICT," in the words of Mr. Jefferson, "WITH AVARICE AND OPPRESSION," the once powerful chiefs of the northern Democracy are forced to submit to the bitter mortification of realizing not only their lost power, but their loss of influence in the councils of the party they have so faithfully followed. The organization of the committees in this chamber cannot but remind the Northern Democratic Senators who yet linger here of their waning power over the legislation of the country, over their political associates, and their duty to follow rather than to lead, to receive orders rather than to give them. Now, the leaders of the Democratic party, the men who dictate its principles and shape its policy are in the South. Well might Mr. Keitt boastingly say, as he did, on a recent occasion, to the people of South Carolina, "issues have been made which have tried the Democratic party;" "its northern hosts have melted away;" "as the Northern wing declined, the Southern wing strengthened;" "the slavery agitation has weakened the party at the North and strengthened it at the South;" "the whole machinery of the party has fallen into the hands of the South," and "the South has the general control of the Democratic party."

Having, Mr. President, forced the Northern Democrats, by threats of political proscription, to repudiate the principle of slavery restriction in the Territories; having forced Mr. Calhoun's dogma upon the Democratic organization; having won the "general control," and secured the "whole machinery," of the Democratic party; these Southern leaders of the slave Democracy, now masters of the Government, are pleased to assume that the policy of the Republican party, sanctioned as it has been by the great statesmen of the past, of the North and South, is a policy of aggression upon the South; and that its success in 1860 will be cause for the dissolution of the Union and the overthrow of the Republic. The chiefs of the Slave Propaganda, the accepted leaders of the Democratic party,

in the public press, in the forum of the people, in the State Legislatures, and in these chambers, are predicting disunion, arguing disunion, and threatening disunion. Every breeze from the South is burdened with these disunion predictions, arguments and threats. In these chambers our ears are fatigued with listening to these disloyal, unpatriotic, revolutionary, but, thank God, impotent avowals. That some of the actors in THIS BROAD FARCE now being played before the nation are in earnest, that they would shiver the Union "from turret to foundation stone," no one who has watched their turbulent career can for a moment doubt; but the vigor of their blow is not equal to the vehemence of their desire. These actors have before shown that they are quite prudent enough to "let *I dare not* wait upon *I would*." This DISUNION FARCE, which the leaders of the slave-extending, slave-perpetuating Democracy have put upon the national stage, and through the parts of which so many actors are moving with such tragic strut, is intended to startle and appall the timid, make the servility of the servile still more abject, rouse the selfish instincts of that nerveless conservatism which has ever opposed every useful reform, and wailed over every rotten institution as it fell; and thus, through the cowardly fears and selfishness of the optimists and quietists, retain their grasp on power. Sir, we shall see whether this disloyal conspiracy will alarm the eighteen million northern freemen; whether the actors in this disunion farce will play a winning game, or whether the insulted patriotism of the country, North and South, will not rebuke this exhibition of madness and folly, and dismiss these actors from the service of that Union they threaten to subvert and destroy.

But this is not, sir, the first time this farce of disunion has been played. When the Republican party sprung into being in 1856, to arrest the aggressions of slavery, to redress the wrongs of the people of Kansas, the leading presses and politicians of the Democracy in the South then predicted, argued and threatened, the dissolution of the Union, if Fremont should be elected. The success of this disunion play in 1856, as well as their own "yawning need" in 1860, may have prompted the Democratic managers to put the old farce upon the stage, in the imposing form now witnessed.

Now, Mr. President, I intend to place before the Senate, and, as far as I can, before the patriotic, liberty-loving and Union-loving men of the free States, the predictions of disunion, the arguments for disunion, and the menaces of disunion, made by some of the presses and some of the men in the interests of slavery—presses that are the exponents of, and men who are the acknowledged leaders of, the sectionalized, slave-extending Democracy. I want the people of Massachusetts and of the country to see that the political secessionists and disunionists are the trusted exponents and the accepted leaders of the National Democracy. I want the alarmed conservatives of the North, who hasten into Union-saving meetings, to see and to realize that the men who are now blurting their disunion sentiments into the unwilling ear of a loyal people, are the leaders of that party which they by their shrinking timidity are upholding in power. I want the deluded masses of the northern Democracy to see the hypocrisy, the arrant cowardice, of their leaders at home, who are fatiguing the weary ear of the country with their worn-out professions of love and devotion to the Union, while they dare not rebuke the disloyal avowals and menaces of the leaders they follow with craven soul and fettered lip.

When, Mr. President, the Republican party, summoned into being and into action in 1856 by the aggressions of slavery, by the crimes against the people of Kansas, appealed, in tones as earnest as ever issued from human lips, to the American people, to their sense of justice, their love of liberty, their emotions of humanity, and their sentiments of patriotism, to all that is highest, noblest, holiest, in human nature, to rescue the Government, arrest slavery-extension, redress the wrongs of the people, and give repose to the country, by restoring the Government to the policy of Washington and Jefferson, Democratic presses and Democratic leaders, whose vital and animating principle is the propagation and expansion of human slavery on the North American continent, raised the startling war-cry of disunion. Timid and selfish conservatism, which saw, unmoved, liberty cloven down in a distant Territory, and heard the imploring appeals for protection of freemen whose sacked and burning cabins illumed the midnight skies, shrank appalled when it heard this cry of disunion, opened its long purse, and continued the destinies of the country in the keeping of men who avowed their intention to ruin if they could not rule it.

Sir, when that uncertain contest was going on, when the election of Fremont seemed to the leaders of the Democracy not only possible, but probable, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. SLIDELL], one of the most skillful leaders of the slave Democracy—the acknowledged friend and champion of Mr. Buchanan—declared to the country that "if Fremont should be elected, the Union would be dissolved." The bold, dashing, and outspoken Senator from Georgia [Mr. TOOMBS] declared, with emphasis, that, "if Fremont was elected, the Union would be dissolved, and ought to be dissolved." The Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON], then, as now, at the head of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who avowed on the floor of the Senate that "the South has the right to the natural expansion of slavery, as an element of political power," declared in a public letter that unless the aggression upon the rights of the South, as he was pleased to designate the resistance of the people of the North against slavery extension, ceased, he was for the "separation of these States." Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, then a leading member of the body, which placed him at the head of the important Committee of the Judiciary, said:

"When Fremont is elected, we must rely upon what we have—a good State Government. Every Governor of the South should call the Legislature of his State together, and have measures of the South decided upon. *If they did not, and submit to the degradation, they would deserve the fate of slaves. I should advise my Legislature to go at the tap of the drum.*'

Sir, I might quote other declarations of Senators, in which these ideas are expressed; but I must pass on. In the House, as the records will bear evidence, these sentiments were profusely uttered by the men who uphold the course of oppression in Kansas, and dictated the policy of the Democratic party. Mr. KEITT, in a fiery and vehement speech to the people of Lynchburgh, Virginia, exclaimed, in view of the apprehended election of Fremont:

"I tell you now, that if Fremont is elected, *adherence to the Union is treason to liberty.* [Loud cheers.] I tell you now, that the Southern man who will submit to his election is a *traitor and a coward.*" [Enthusiastic cheers.]

This speech, so contemptuous, so defiant toward the people of the North, so emphatic in its avowals of disunion, was promptly indorsed as "sound doctrine" by John B. Floyd, now Mr. Buchanan's Secretary of War—a gentleman of whom the "Boston Post," the leading Administration organ of New England, in 1850 said, "henceforth he must be treated as a disunionist, and the most dangerous of them all." In the autumn of 1856, Mr. Brooks, of South Carolina, received from the people of his district an ovation. Senator BUTLER and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TOOMBS] attended, and other Southern Democratic leaders sent applauding letters. To the assembled people of his district, Mr. BROOKS said:

"We have the issue upon us now; and how are we to meet it? I tell you, fellow-citizens, from the bottom of my heart, that the only mode which I think available for meeting it *is just to tear the Constitution of the United States, trample it under foot, and form a Southern Confederacy, every State of which will be a slaveholding State* [Loud and prolonged cheers.] I believe it, as I stand in the face of my Maker; I believe it on my responsibility to you as your honored representative, that *the only hope of the South is in the South, and that the only available means of making the last hope effective is to cut asunder the bonds that tie us together and take our separate position in the family of nations.* These are my opinions. They have always been my opinions. *I have been a disunionist from the time I could think.*"

"Now, fellow-citizens, I have told you, very frankly and undisguisedly, that I believe *the only hope of the South is in dissolving the bonds which connect us with the Government—in separating the living body from the dead carcass.* If I was the commander of an army, *I never would post a sentinel who would not swear that slavery is right.*"

"I speak on my individual responsibility: *If Fremont be elected President of the United States, I am for the people in their majesty rising above the law and leaders, taking the power into their own hands, going by concert, or not by concert, and laying the strong arm of Southern freemen upon the Treasury and archives of the Government.*" [Applause.]

These emphatic avowals of disunion were applauded by the people who had, by a unanimous vote, sustained his action, and commissioned him to speak for them in this capitol. Well might the "Charleston Mercury" declare, as it has, that—

"*Upon the policy of dissolving the Union, of separating the South from her Northern enemies, and establishing a Southern Confederacy, parties, presses, politicians and people were at unit. There is not a single public man in her limits, not one of her present Representatives or Senators in Congress, who is not pledged to the lips in favor of disunion.* Indeed, we well remember that one of the most prominent leaders of the co-operation party, when taunted with submission, rebuked the thought by saying, '*that in opposing secession, he only took a step backward to strike a blow more deadly against the Union.*'"

Sir, the erratic, aspiring, blustering Wise, who "would introduce slavery into the heart of the North," who "would allow slavery to pour itself out without restraint, and find no limit but the Southern Ocean," in the autumn of 1856 told the people of Virginia that—

"The South could not, without degradation, submit to the election of a Black Republican President. To tell me we should submit to the election of a Black Republican, under circumstances like these, is to tell me that Virginia and the fourteen slave States are already subjugated and degraded, [cheers;] that the Southern people are without spirit and without purpose to defend the rights they know and dare not maintain. [Cheers.] If you submit to the election of Fremont, you will prove what Seward and Burlingame said to be true—that the South cannot be kicked out of the Union."

He avowed his readiness to put the military force of Virginia upon a war footing; and he gave the valorous assurance to his disunion associates that "the chivalry" of Virginia "would hew its bright way through all opposing legions." Rumor said, and I believe truly, that this Democratic aspirant to the Presidency held correspondence with Southern Governors to concert measures preparatory to disunion; that he and his disunion compeers organized a plot to seize the arsenal at Harper's Ferry, to take possession of the navy-yard at Norfolk, and inaugurate rebellion, revolution and disunion, in the event of Fremont's success.

The Washington correspondent of the "New Orleans Delta," a journal high in the confidence of the Pierce administration, wrote:

"It is already arranged, in the event of Fremont's election, or a failure to elect by the people, to call the Legislatures of Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia, to concert measures to withdraw from the Union before Fremont can get possession of the army and navy and the purse-strings of Government. *Governor Wise is actively at work already in the matter. The South can rely on the President in the emergency contemplated.* The question now is, whether the people of the South will sustain their leaders."

Mr. Corry, of Ohio, reports Mr. Banks, of Virginia, as having said to him, a few days after the election in 1856, that—

"The South would have dissolved the Union, if Fremont had been elected President of the United States; that Governor Wise and the Virginia leaders were ready to take the field—march on Washington, depose the Federal officers, take the Treasury, archives, buildings, grounds, etc.—declare the Confederation *de facto* overthrown. He said the thing would have been easy; there were thirty thousand men ready; twenty thousand cavalry; sets of accoutrements; that the public mind was sufficiently excited to overcome all domestic resistance, and that they could whip the North in the fight."

A Union meeting was recently held at Knoxville, Tennessee. At this meeting, Judge Daily, recently of Georgia, submitted a series of resolutions as an amendment to the resolutions of the committee, and made an extreme Southern speech in support of them. In this speech he said that—

"During the Presidential contest, Gov. Wise had addressed letters to all the Southern Governors, and that *the one to the Governor of Florida had been shown him, in which Gov. Wise said that he had an army in readiness to prevent Fremont from taking his seat* if elected, and asking the cooperation of those to whom he wrote."

Evidence of this disloyal, revolutionary and treasonable course of Henry A. Wise is also furnished by Charles J. Faulkner, late Representative of the Harper's Ferry district, chairman of the Congressional Democratic Committee in 1856, and now Minister to France. At a Democratic meeting recently held in Virginia, over which Mr. Faulkner presided, he said:

"When that noble and gallant son of Virginia, Henry A. Wise, declared, as was said he did in October, 1856, that, if Fremont should be elected, HE WOULD SEIZE THE NATIONAL ARSENAL AT HARPER'S FERRY, how few would, at that time, have justified so bold and decided a measure? *It is the fortune of some great and gifted minds to see far in advance of their cotemporaries.* Should William H. Seward be elected in 1860, where is the man now in our midst *who would not call for the impeachment of a Governor of Virginia who would silently suffer that armory to pass under the control of such an Executive head?*"

This "noble and gallant son of Virginia," who, in 1856, "saw far in advance of his cotemporaries," who was ready, if Fremont had been elected, "to seize the arsenal at Harper's Ferry," is now looking with hungry eye to the Charleston Convention, and is now the applauded and favorite hero of a class of men in the North who are stammering into the ears of a doubting people their uxorious love of the Union; and this Democratic orator, who would demand the impeachment of a Governor of Virginia if he should permit the arsenal at Harper's Ferry to pass under the control of William H. Seward, if elected to the Presidency, is nominated by a Democratic President, and confirmed by the united voice of the Democratic Senators, to represent the Republic at the court of Louis Napoleon. This Democratic Administration, and this Democratic party, which invokes the support of the Union-loving, conservative men of the free States, send to the proudest monarch of the Old World the man who uttered this insurrectionary and disloyal sentiment. Yes, sir; Democrats, with the accents of Union upon their lips, sanction the appointment of a man who is avowedly in favor of civil war and disunion. Let the real friends of law, of order, of the unity o the Republic, mark and remember this want of fidelity to the Union, by the Administration and the men who lead the Democratic party.

Sir, the "Richmond Enquirer," the leading Democratic organ south of the Potomac, during the canvass of 1856, avowedly advocated disunion. That exponent of the slave Democracy said:

"Sumner, and Sumner's friends, must be punished and silenced. Either such wretches must be hung or put in the penitentiary, or the South should prepare at once to quit the Union."

"If Fremont is elected, the Union will not last an hour after Mr. Pierce's term expires."

"If Fremont is elected, it will be the duty of the South to dissolve the Union and form a Southern Confederacy."

"Let the South present a compact and undivided front. Let her, if possible, detach Pennsylvania and southern Ohio, southern Indiana, and southern Illinois, from the North, and make the highlands between the Ohio and the lakes the dividing line. Let the South treat with California; and, if necessary, ally herself with Russia, with Cuba and Brazil."

Sir, this journal, which, during the canvass, avowed the rankest disunion sentiments—this journal, which had been the trumpet of the alarmists, after the election had been won by the aid, the "material aid," of alarmed and quaking conservatism, very naively announced to the victims of this disunion panic that "*Governor Wise threatened disunion only to save the Union!*" Yes, sir; the valiant Wise, ready to put the military force of his dominions on a war footing; ready to hew his bright way through all opposing legions; ready to seize Harper's Ferry, "only threatened disunion to save the Union!" Patriotic Wise! Who, in view of the sagacious patriotism of that "noble and gallant son of Virginia," will not accept the tribute of the admiring Faulkner, that "it is the fortune of some great and gifted minds to see far in advance of their contemporaries?" May not shivering, despairing conservatism indulge the faint hope that other "noble and gallant sons of Virginia" and of the sunny South may, in humble imitation of the far-seeing Wise, be "threatening disunion only to save the Union?"

We are entering, Mr. President, upon another Presidential election; another great struggle for supremacy in the national councils between the opposing forces of slavery extension and slavery restriction. The nation once more presents to mankind "the interesting spectacle of justice in conflict with avarice and oppression." This "conflict" is stirring the country to its profoundest depths. Conscious of their waning power, the advocates of slavery extension are again haughtily menacing the dissolution of the Union in the event of their defeat by the people. Again, in the public press, in assemblages of the people, in State legislatures, and in these chambers, disloyal and revolutionary threats are made, to intimidate the people.

Sir, the Senator from Georgia, before the meeting of Congress, boasted before the people of his State, that "the proud and enviable condition of the poor men in the South, compared to the degraded WHITE SLAVES OF THE NORTH, is owing to the existence of African slavery in the South."

Mr. IVERSON. Will the Senator allow me to ask which Senator from Georgia he refers to?

Mr. WILSON. The Senator who is now on the floor.

Mr. IVERSON. Then, that is a mistake. I never used any such language.

Mr. WILSON. I quoted it from a Georgia paper, which published it at the time.

Mr. IVERSON. I deny it positively. My speech is on record and in print. The gentleman shall have a copy of it, if he wants one.

Mr. WILSON. It was a speech made in Georgia during the summer.

Mr. IVERSON. I made no such declaration as that. What I did say was simply this: that the condition of African slavery at the South elevated the poor white man; but I did not speak of the poor people of the North as slaves, by any means.

Mr. WILSON. Then the Senator is misquoted by his own papers, and I withdraw it as far as that is concerned. I will go on with the rest of the quotation from the same speech, and the Senator can deny that or not. The Senator, at the same meeting where he is reported to have used the words which he now disclaims, and which I am glad he disclaims, is reported to have said:

"*Slavery must be maintained—in the Union, if possible; out of it, if necessary; peaceably if we may, forcibly if we must.*"

Mr. IVERSON. I said that.

Mr. WILSON. And the Senator drew this flattering view of a Southern Confederation:

"In a confederated government of their own, the southern States would enjoy sources of wealth, prosperity and power unsurpassed by any nation on earth. No neutrality laws would restrain our adventurous sons. Our expanding policy would stretch far beyond present limits. Central America would join her destiny to ours, and so would Cuba, now withheld from us by the voice and votes of Abolition enemies."

Coming in this chamber, the honorable Senator early sought occasion to say:

"Sir, I will tell you what I would do, if I had the control of the Southern members of this house and the other, when you elect JOHN SHERMAN. If I had control of the public sentiment, the very moment you elect JOHN SHERMAN, thus giving to the South the example of insult as well as injury, I would walk, every one of us, out of the halls of this capitol, and consult our constituents: and I would never enter again until I was bade to do so by those who had the right to control me. Sir, I go further than that. I would counsel my constituents instantly to dissolve all political ties with a party and a people who thus trample on our rights. That is what I would do."

In a carefully-prepared and very elaborate speech recently delivered, the Senator from Georgia said:

"Sir, there is but one path of safety to the South; but one mode of preserving her institution of domestic slavery; and that is, a confederacy of States having no incongruous and opposing elements—a confederacy of slave States alone, with homogeneous language, laws, interests and institutions. Under such a confederated republic, with a constitution which should shut out the approach and entrance of all incongruous and conflicting elements, which should protect the institution from change, and keep the whole nation ever bound to its preservation by an unchangeable fundamental law, the fifteen slave States, with their power of expansion, would present to the world the most free, prosperous and happy nation on the face of the wide earth.

"Sir, with these views, and with the firm conviction which I have entertained for many years, and which recent events have only seemed to confirm, that the 'irrepressible conflict' between the two sections must and will go on, and with accumulated speed, and must end, in the Union, with the total extinction of African slavery in the southern States, that I have announced my determination to approve and urge the southern States to dissolve the Union upon the election of a Black Republican to the Presidency of the United States by a sectional Northern party, and upon a platform of opposition and hostility to Southern slavery."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BROWN], in the speech to his constituents from which I have already quoted, and in which he avows his desire to acquire territory in Central America and Mexico "to plant slavery in," says:

"Whether we can obtain the territory while the Union lasts, I do not know; I fear we cannot. But I would make an honest effort, and if we failed, I would go out of the Union, and try it there. I speak plainly—I would make a refusal to acquire territory, because it was to be slave territory, a cause for disunion, just as I would make the refusal to admit a new State, because it was to be a slave State, a cause for disunion."

Surely no one can mistake the position of the Senator. If the people of the free States, who believe slavery to be what Henry Clay said it was, "a curse," "a wrong—a grievous wrong," that "no contingency could make right," should refuse to acquire territory "because it was to be slave territory," he would make that refusal "cause for disunion." The Senator has laid upon our desks an address, delivered in the capitol of the State he so ably and faithfully represents; and in this address, I find this declaration:

"The election of Mr. SEWARD, or any other man of his party, is not, *per se*, justifiable ground for dissolving the *Union*. But

the *act* of putting the Government in the hands of men who mean to use it for our subjugation, ought to be resisted, even to the disruption of every tie that binds us to the Union."

On the 6th of July, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DAVIS,] whose ability and large and varied information are acknowledged by the Senate and the country, delivered an elaborate address to the people of his State. By common consent, the country recognizes the Senator from Mississippi as one of the foremost leaders of his section and his party, and his opinions command attention and consideration. In this address, the honorable Senator says:

"For myself, I say, as I said on a former occasion, in the contingency of the election of a President on the platform of Mr. SEWARD'S Rochester speech, let the Union be dissolved. Let the 'great but not the greatest of evils' come."

On the 11th of November, 1858, after his return from a visit of several months to New England, the Senator addressed the people of his State at Jackson. In this address, the Senator is reported to have said, "if the Republicans should elect a President, the question would be presented, what should the South do? For his part, he had but *one answer to give*. When that happened, when the Government was in hostile hands, when the Presidency and the houses of legislation were controlled by the enemies of the South, *he was for asserting the independence of Mississippi; he was for immediate withdrawal from the Union*." And in view of the aspect of public affairs, the honorable Senator "advised the people of the South to turn their old muskets into Minie rifles, prepare powder, shot, shell, ammunition of all kinds, and fortifications, so as to be ready against any emergency."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. CLAY] early addressed the Senate upon the resolution introduced by the Senator from Virginia, [Mr. MASON;] and in this speech, prepared with the elaborate care that Senator is accustomed to bestow upon the subjects he discusses here, the Senator assumes, in effect, the position that it is impossible for the people of the South to live under a Government administered by the Republican party. He asks:

"Do you suppose that we intend to bow our necks to the yoke? that we intend to submit to the domination of our enemies? that we intend to sit here in your presence as hostages for the good behavior of our conquered people—a people who will be, under your administration, not as sovereigns to rule but as subjects to be governed?"

In response, the Senator says:

"I make no predictions, no promise for my State; but, in conclusion, will only say, that if she is faithful to the pledges she has made and principles she has professed—if she is true to her own interest and her own honor—if she is not recreant to all that State pride, integrity and duty demand—she will never submit to your authority. I will add, that unless she, and all the southern States of this Union, with perhaps but two, or, at most, three exceptions, are not faithless to the pledges they have given, *they will never submit to the government of a President professing your political faith and elected by your sectional majority*."

When the Senator from Alabama took his seat, the Senator from California [Mr. GWIN] rose, and declared that he considered "it as the inevitable result, that the South should prepare for resistance in the event of the election of a Republican President." The Senator went on to argue that the South must, could and would, dissolve the Union, if the Republican party succeed in the coming election. That Senator went on to show how the South could carry out the scheme of disunion; how she could seize the public property within her limits; that, by doing so, before the Government passed into the control of such an Administration, it could put it out of the power of the Administration to administer the Government in that portion of the country. And he declared that "it is impossible for a Republican President to administer this Government over the slaveholding States of the Confederacy;" and that "the election of a Republican President is the inevitable destruction of this Confederacy."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. TOOMBS] began his speech yesterday by solemnly announcing that the country was in the midst of a civil revolution, and closed it by imploring the freemen of the State he represents to "redeem their pledge," and "never permit this Federal Government to pass into the traitorous hands of the Black Republican party." He calls upon the people of Georgia to "listen to 'no vain babblings,' to no treacherous jargon about 'overt acts;' they have already been committed. Defend yourselves, the enemy is at your door; wait not to meet him at the hearthstone—meet him at the doorsill, and drive him from the temple of liberty, or pull down its pillars and involve him in a common ruin."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. CLINGMAN] assures us that in the South "there are hundreds of disunionists now where there was one ten years ago;" that in some of the States men who "would willingly to-day see the Union dissolved" are in the majority, and in other States a large class of men are "ready to unite with them upon the happening of a cause." And he says:

"In my judgment, the election of the Presidential candidate of the Black Republican party will furnish that cause."

To the suggestion that they "ought to wait for some overt act," the Senator says:

"No other '*overt act*' can so imperatively demand resistance on our part as the simple election of their candidate. Their organization is one of avowed hostility, and they come against us as *enemies*."

Referring to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. SEWARD], he declares that—

"The objections are not personal merely to this Senator, but apply equally to any member of the party elected by it. It has, in fact, been suggested that, as a matter of prudence, for the first election they should choose a Southern freesoiler. Would the colonies have submitted more willingly to Benedict Arnold than to Lord Cornwallis?"

But the Senator seems to be in favor of the secession of the States, but not of the secession of members of Congress. He says:

"I may say, however, that I do not think there will be any secession of the Southern members of Congress from this Capitol. It has always struck me that this is a point not to be voluntarily surrendered to the public enemy."

The Senator from North Carolina evidently indulges in the pleasing illusion that "the public enemy," as he is pleased to characterize his fellow-countrymen, will abandon the Capitol, if "the southern members of Congress" remain in the Capitol. "If lives should be lost here," exclaims the Senator "it would seem poetically just that this should occur!" If, after this declaration of seeming valor, the Republicans, in the event of their success in November, do not flee from the Capitol with as much haste as did the "chivalry" of this region in the late war with England, I am quite sure the Senator from North Carolina, who is "struck" with the original idea "that this is a point not to be voluntarily surrendered to the public enemy," will be disappointed in his expectations. But the Senator goes on to express his emotions of contempt for men of the non-resistant school. "I cannot find," says the Senator, "words enough to express my abhorrence and detestation of such creatures as Garrison and Wendell Phillips, who stimulate others to deeds of blood, and, at the same time, are so cowardly that they avoid all danger themselves." This expression of "abhorrence and detestation" of such non-combatants, such "cowardly" creatures, is, I suppose, intended to admonish us on this side of the chamber that the Senator is terribly in earnest when he makes proclamation of his wishes in these words:

"*As from this Capitol so much has gone forth to inflame the public mind, if our countrymen are to be involved in a bloody struggle, I trust in God that the first fruits of the collision may be reaped here.*"

This language, Mr. President, admits of but one interpretation. Gentlemen from the South, who are in favor of a dissolution of the Union, do not intend, in so doing, to secede from this Capitol, nor surrender it to those who may remain within the Union. Having declared that, if lives are to be sacrificed, it will be poetically just that they should be sacrificed here on this floor: and that, as so much has gone forth from this Capitol to inflame the public mind, it is but proper that the first fruit of the struggle should be reaped here, the Senator gives us, therefore, distinctly to understand that there may be a physical collision—"a bloody struggle;" that the scene of this conflict is to be the legislative halls of this Capitol. To simply say, in reply to this threat, that northern senators cannot thus be intimidated, is too tame and commonplace to meet the exigency. Therefore, I take it upon myself to inform the Senator from North Carolina, that the people of the free States have sent their representatives here, not to fight, but to legislate; not to mingle in personal combats, but to deliberate for the good of the whole country; not to shed the blood of their fellow members, but to maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and uphold the Union—and this they will endeavor to do here, in the legislative halls of the Capitol, at all events and at every hazard. In the performance of their duties, they will not invade the rights of others, nor permit any infringement of their own. They will invite no collision, they will commence no attack; but they will discharge all their obligations to their constituents, and maintain the Government and institutions of their country in the face of all conceivable consequences. Whoever thinks otherwise has not studied either the history of the people of the free States, or the character of the men dwelling in that section of the Union, or the philosophy of the exigency which the Senator from North Carolina seems to invoke. The freemen of the North have not been accustomed to vaunt their courage in words; they have preferred to illustrate it by deeds. They are not fighting men by profession, nor accustomed to street broils, nor contests on the "field of honor," falsely so called, nor are they habitual wearers of deadly weapons. Therefore it is that when driven into bloody collisions, and especially on sudden emergencies, it is as true in fact as it is sound in philosophy, that they are more desperate and determined, and more reckless of consequences to themselves and to their antagonists, than are those who are more accustomed to contemplate such collisions. The tightest band, when once broken, recoils with the wildest power. So much for the people of the free States. As to their representatives in this Capitol I will say, that if, while in the discharge of their duties here, they are assaulted with deadly intent, I give the Senator from North Carolina due notice, here, to-day, that those assaults will be repelled and retaliated by sons who will not dishonor fathers that fought at Bunker Hill and conquered at Saratoga, that trampled the soil of Chippewa and Lundy's Lane to a bloody mire, and vindicated sailors' rights and national honor on the high seas in the second war of independence. Reluctant to enter into such a contest, yet, once in, they will be quite as reluctant to leave it. Though they may not be the first to go into the struggle, they will be the last to abandon it in dishonor. Though they will not provoke nor commence the conflict, they will do their best to conquer when the strife begins. So much their constituents will demand of them when the "bloody struggle" the Senator contemplates is forced upon them; and they will not be disappointed when the exigency comes. I say no more; I wait the issue, and bide my time.

Mr. President, during the protracted and excited contest in the other end of the Capitol, the leaders of the Democracy have avowed the rankest disunion sentiments; and these avowals of disloyalty to the Union have been often rapturously applauded on the Democratic side of the chamber, and in the galleries, crowded, as they have often been, by Government officials or Government contractors or dependents. Sir, if the Union-loving, liberty-loving, patriotic men of the country could have heard these menaces of disunion; could have

witnessed the applauding throngs in the galleries, and the applauding Democracy on the floor; and could have witnessed the Democratic smiles, the Democratic nods, and the Democratic congratulations, they would visit upon the actors in this farce, and upon their compeers here and at home, the stern rebuke and withering scorn of an indignant people.

Early in the session, Mr. NELSON, of Tennessee, a distinguished member of the Southern Opposition, rebuked the disunion sentiments which had been so profusely scattered through the debates by the secessionists; and he avowed his devotion to the Union in tones of thrilling eloquence. His patriotic and national sentiments received the enthusiastic applause of the Southern Opposition and the Republicans. The patriotic sentiments of the eloquent Tennessean, reminding us of the days, before the advent into these halls of the secession disciples of Calhoun, when the followers of Clay—ay, and of Jackson, too—had made the chambers echo with sentiments of devotion to the Union, seemed to grate harshly upon Democratic ears.

Mr. PRYOR, of Virginia, who, in 1856, as one of the editors of the "Richmond Enquirer," echoed the disunion sentiments of Gov. Wise, rose and propounded to Mr. NELSON this question:

"Would you be willing WILLIAM H. SEWARD should take possession of the army, the navy, and all the powers of the Government—I mean all the constitutional powers of the President of the United States? Would he allow WILLIAM H. SEWARD to take possession of these powers, or would he resist it even to the extent of going out of the Union?"

Sir, this question clearly implied that Mr. PRYOR would resist, even to the extent of going out of the Union, the inauguration of WILLIAM H. SEWARD. But that was early in the session. Gov. Wise, who, if Faulkner is to be relied upon, "sees far in advance of his contemporaries," had not then avowed his resolution to fight in the Union, and to stay in the Union. The "Enquirer," the family organ, which is engaged in warning the people of the South not to "precipitate disunion, but to prepare for it," has made the wonderful discovery that "the election of a Black Republican advocate of the 'irrepressible conflict' will be the withdrawal of the States *supporting such election* from the Union." As Gov. Wise has resolved to fight in the Union, and as his family organ has declared that the election of a Republican is a withdrawal of the States supporting his election from the Union, Mr. PRYOR will not now resist the inauguration of WILLIAM H. SEWARD, "to the extent of going out of the Union," but cling to this new "Virginia abstraction," and assume that the States voting for Mr. SEWARD are out of the Union.

Mr. CURRY, of Alabama, in a speech which is by far the most comprehensive and philosophical presentation of the issues yet made on the slavery side, in the House, said:

"However distasteful it may be to my friend from New York [Mr. CLARK], however much it may revolt the public sentiment or conscience of this country, I am not ashamed or afraid publicly to avow that the election of WILLIAM H. SEWARD or Salmon P. Chase, or any such representative of the Republican party, upon a sectional platform, ought to be resisted to the disruption of every tie that binds this Confederacy together." [Applause on the Democratic side of the House.]

Mr. PUGH, of the same State, in a speech of much rhetorical beauty and eloquence, said:

"If, with the character of the Government well defined, and the rights and privileges of the parties to the compact clearly asserted by the Democratic party, the Black Republicans get possession of the Government, then the question is fully presented, whether the southern States will remain in the Union, as subject and degraded colonies, or will they withdraw and establish a southern Confederacy of coequal homogeneous sovereigns?

"In my judgment, the latter is the only course compatible with the honor, equality, and safety of the South; and the sooner it is known and acted upon the better for all parties to the compact.

"The truest conservatism and wisest statesmanship demand a speedy termination of all association with such confederates, and the formation of another Union of States, homogeneous in population, institutions, interests and pursuits."

Mr. MOORE, of the same State, said:

"I do not concur with the declaration made yesterday by the gentleman from Tennessee, that the election of a Black Republican to the Presidency was not cause for a dissolution of the Union. Whenever a President is elected by a fanatical majority at the North, those whom I represent, as I believe, and the gallant State which I in part represent, are ready, let the consequences be what they may, to fall back on their reserved rights, and say: 'As to this Union, we have no longer any lot or part in it.'"

Mr. BOYCE, of South Carolina, before the meeting of Congress, addressed his constituency in an elaborate and very carefully-prepared speech, in which he says that the election of a President by the Republican party "would constitute of itself a good reason why the South should refuse to submit to their rule." "Our policy is, first, to prevent, if possible, the election of a Republican President; second, if this must occur, in spite of all our wise exertions to the contrary, to cause it to occur under such issues as will best enable us to set up a southern Government." "The great point then, is to ripen public opinion at the South for a dissolution of the Union in the contingency referred to—the election of a Republican President." He avows that "it is the fixed policy of this State to secede as soon as the Republican party elect their President." "If we desire to ripen public opinion among ourselves for southern independence, in the event of the election of a Republican President, we must exercise the policy of moderation in our movements preliminary to that result. We must use the most consummate prudence now, that we may be able to profit by the most desperate boldness then."

Mr. BONHAM, of the same State, said, on the floor of the House:

"As to disunion, upon the election of a Black Republican, I can speak for no one but myself and those I have here the honor to represent: and I say, without hesitation, that, upon the election of Mr. SEWARD, or any other man who indorses and proclaims the doctrines held by him and his party—call him by what name you please—I am in favor of an immediate dissolution of the Union. And, sir, I think I speak the sentiments of my own constituents and the State of South Carolina, when I say so."

"Mr. CRAWFORD, of Georgia, as a quotation from his speech will show, spoke not only for himself, but for his associates from that State, and his disunion sentiments received the applause of his Democratic friends:

"Now, in regard to the election of a Black Republican President, I have this to say, and I speak the sentiment of every Democrat on this floor from the State of Georgia; we will never submit to the inauguration of a Black Republican President. [Applause from the Democratic benches, and hisses from the Republicans.] I repeat it, sir—and I have authority to say so—that no Democratic Representative from Georgia on this floor will ever submit to the inauguration of a Black Republican President. [Renewed applause and hisses.] . . . The most confiding of them all are, sir, for 'equality in the Union or independence out of it;' having lost all hope in the former, I am for 'INDEPENDENCE NOW AND INDEPENDENCE FOREVER!'"

Mr. GARTRELL, also of Georgia, has supported the position assumed by Mr. Crawford. He declares:

"Just so sure as the Republican party succeeds in electing a sectional man, upon their sectional, anti-slavery platform, breathing destruction and death to the rights of my people, just so sure, in my judgment, the time will have come when the South must and will take an unmistakable and decided action, and that then, 'he who dallies is a dastard, and he who doubts is damned.' I need not tell what I, as a southern man, will do—I think I may safely speak for the masses of the people of Georgia—that when that event happens, they, in my judgment, will consider it an overt act, a declaration of war, and meet immediately in convention, to take into consideration the mode and measure of redress. That is my position; and if that be treason to the Government, make the most of it."

Governor MCRAE, of Mississippi, declared that he was not willing to submit to the election of a Republican President upon a Republican platform:

"I said to my constituents, and to the people at the capital of my State, on my way here, that at such an event did occur, while it would be their duty to determine the course which the State would pursue, it would be my privilege to counsel with them as to what I believed to be the proper course; and I said to them, what I say now, and will always say in such an event, that my counsel would be to take independence out of the Union in preference to the loss of constitutional rights and consequent degradation and dishonor in it. That is my position, and it is the position which I know the Democratic party of the State of Mississippi will maintain."

Mr. DE JARNETTE, of Virginia, will resist the inauguration of the candidate of the Republican party, if that candidate is Mr. Seward, for he says:

"Thus WILLIAM H. SEWARD stands before the country a perjured traitor; and yet that man, with hands stained with the blood of our citizens, we are asked to elect President of the United States. You may elect him President of the North, but of the South never. Whatever the event may be, others may differ; but Virginia, in view of her ancient renown, in view of her illustrious dead, and in view of her *sic semper tyrannis*, will resist his authority. I have done."

Mr. LEAKE, unlike his colleague, Mr. PRYOR, will not follow the lead of the late Governor Wise and fight inside the Union, Mr. Leake evidently does not see so far in advance as does that noble son of Virginia. He says:

"I repudiate the sentiment which the gentleman ascribes to the late Governor of Virginia. I choose rather to refer to the representatives of that State to hear her sentiments, than to any other source. It never entered my head, and I undertake to say that it never entered the brain of any representative of Virginia on this floor, to fight inside of this Union. The idea is ridiculous in the extreme. It is the *reductio ad absurdum*."

And Mr. LEAKE emphatically declares that

"Virginia has the right, when she pleases, to withdraw from the Confederacy. [Applause from the Democratic benches.] . . . That is her doctrine. We will not fight in the Union, but quit it the instant we think proper to do so."

Mr. SINGLETON, of Mississippi, openly avows, on the floor of the House, that "their determination is fixed and unalterable; that they will have an expansion of slave territory in the Union if you will allow it, or outside of the Union if they must;" and that sentiment was received with Democratic applause. He goes on to say:

"The question now is, if we sever the connection which binds us and the North together, how are we to preserve the institution of slavery? There is but one mode by which, in my humble judgment, it can be perpetuated for any considerable number of years. . . . That mode is by expansion, and that expansion must be in the direction of Mexico. . . . . There is in Mexico a large extent of territory that is suited to the cultivation of cotton, sugar, and rice. In my opinion, we must, and we are compelled, to expand in that direction, and thus perpetuate it—a hundred or a thousand years, it may be. . . .

"It may be asked, when will the time come when we shall separate from the North? I say, candidly, if the views expressed by the gentleman from Iowa are, as he says, common to the Republican party, and if they are determined to enforce

those views, I declare myself ready to-day. I would not ask to delay the time a single hour." . . .

"You ask me, when will the time come? when will the South be united? It will be when you elect a Black Republican—Hale, Seward, or Chase—President of the United States. Whenever you undertake to place such a man to preside over the destinies of the South, you may expect to see us undivided and indivisible friends, and to see all parties of the South arrayed to resist his inauguration." . . .

"We can never quietly stand by and permit the control of the army and navy to go into the hands of a Black Republican President."

Union sentiments, whenever or by whomsoever uttered, grate harshly on Democratic ears tuned to the accents of disunion. When Mr. STOKES, of Tennessee, the other day, rebuked the disloyal sentiments which fell so glibly from Democratic lips—when he,in eloquent, manly and patriotic language, declared his devotion to the Union—when he quoted, and indorsed as his own, the words of Henry Clay, "that he would consent to the dissolution of the Union—never! never! never!!!"—the Democracy foamed and gnashed its teeth in impotent wrath.

Governor Letcher, of Virginia, in his recent message to the Legislature of his State, avows the rankest disunion and revolutionary sentiments. In this document, he declares that if a Republican President is elected in 1860.

"It is useless to attempt to conceal the fact that, in the present temper of the Southern people, *it cannot be and will not be submitted to.* The 'irrepressible-conflict' doctrine, announced and advocated by the ablest and most distinguished leader of the Republican party, is an open declaration of war against the institution of African slavery, wherever it exists; and I would be disloyal to Virginia and the South if I did not declare that the election of such a man, entertaining such sentiments and advocating such doctrines, *ought to be resisted by the slaveholding States.* The idea of permitting such a man to have the control and direction of the army and navy of the United States, and the appointment of high judicial and executive officers, postmasters included, *cannot be entertained by the South for a moment.*"

I might quote, Mr. President, the avowals of disunion sentiments by other Democratic leaders and other Democratic presses; for these avowals of disloyalty to the unity of the Republic are scattered, in rank luxuriance, broadcast over the land. But I must pause.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator pardon me a moment? He seems to charge the sentiments, which he calls disunion sentiments, on the Democratic party mainly. So far as the State of Alabama is involved in that charge, I may speak advisedly when I say that sentiments, such as I uttered and which he has quoted, have been indorsed unanimously by the Legislature of the State which I have the honor to represent. And if the Senator will pardon me further, I will say, too, that those who call themselves Americans or Oppositionists there, I think, have gone even further than the Democratic party. Hence, I hardly think it is just to the American party in the South to attribute these sentiments exclusively to the Democratic party. I think the other side are entitled to a share of the credit of them.

Mr. WILSON. It may be so in the gentleman's own State; I know that on the Gulf they are running wild with disunion; but how is it with the representatives of the Southern Opposition on the floor of the House of Representatives? Their sentiments have been pronounced, nearly all of them, distinctly in favor of the Union.

I have, however, gathered up enough of these noisy menaces of disunion, which are falling thick and fast around us, to show to the Senate and the country that the accepted leaders of the Democratic party are secessionists and disunionists, with the accents of disunion perpetually on their lips, and its spirit burning in their hearts. I have also gathered up, from the mass of facts which lie at my feet, enough to show that the Democratic party is *tainted* with the odor of disunion, that the *stain* of disloyalty is now indelibly stamped upon its brow. I have shown, too, that these menaces of disunion, which Democratic leaders are hurling around us in this Capitol go unrebuked by the northern Democracy, whose glory it is to follow these apostles of secession and disunion. The country will not fail to see, and to mark, too, the discreditable fact, that while Democratic leaders in these chambers are muttering angry menaces of disunion, and while such madness goes unrebuked, even by the faintest whispers of the Democratic representatives of the loyal North and West, the Democratic presses in the North and West are busy—not in raining upon the heads of Democratic disunionists the withering rebukes of patriotism—but in the work of misrepresenting and maligning those who cling to the Union with unswerving fidelity alike in victory and in defeat. The country, too, will not fail to see that the Democratic orators dare not, even at a safe distance, utter the softest censure against the disloyalty of leaders they follow as the bondman follows his master, but they are appealing to the selfish fears of men to disown their manhood, and, by acts of humiliation, appease the awakened wrath of the Democratic chieftains now menacing the integrity of the Union.

Mr. President, the American Democracy, led by slave perpetuists and propagandists, secessionists and disunionists, now in the light of this age, stands before the nation the enemy of human progress, and in favor of the conservation and propagation of old abuses. No longer does the Democracy utter the accents of popular rights. No longer does the Democracy sympathize with man, at home or abroad, struggling for the recovery of lost rights or the enlargement of existing privileges. Does the Legislature of Kansas pass an act for the abolition of slavery there? Democracy resists it, and arrests it, by Executive action. Does the Legislature of Nebraska, left "perfectly free to form their own domestic institutions in their own way," pass a bill to wipe from that vast Territory the pollution of slavery? Democracy resists it, defeats it, by the Executive veto, and applauds that veto. Does the Legislature of New Mexico enact a bloody slave code? Democracy prompts it, praises it, applauds it. Does a sovereign Commonwealth lighten by humane legislation the burdens of a proscribed race, so that it may rise into the sunlight of a broader and higher manhood? Democracy is outraged, shocked, and it avenges itself by gibbering taunts, gibes and jeers. Does a slave State enact, or propose to enact, statutes to still more oppress those already bending under the iron heel of oppression, or to check the action of its own citizens who may be prompted by sentiments of benevolence or a sense of justice to lessen the bitterness of bondage or give freedom to their own bondmen? Democracy approves and applauds it. Does Walker, at the head of a lawless band of fillibusters, decree slavery in Central America? Democracy hails and applauds that decree. Does any indication point to the possible abolition of slavery in Cuba? Democracy protests, cannot permit it, will pay $200,000,000 for that slaveholding isle, but will not accept the "Gem of the Antilles," if burdened with freedom. Does England strike the fetters from the limbs of eight hundred thousand West India bondmen? Democracy deplores it, disapproves it, and persists in misrepresenting the effects of that great act of justice and humanity.

Does the Emperor of Russia propose a plan for the emancipation of millions, not of the African race, but of white men? Democracy shakes its head, shrugs its shoulders, utters no note of joy, sends no word of encouragement or greeting to the enlightened monarch who would enlarge the rights and elevate the condition of men. Does the Republican party, imbued with the sentiments of the Republican fathers, propose to arrest the expansion of slavery over the territories of the Republic, and save those territories to free labor, check the re-opening slave traffic, and put the National Government in harmony with a progressive Christian civilization? Democracy, smitten with the consciousness of its waning power, raises the startling cry of disunion. To its abandonment of the sentiments, opinions and policy of the Republican fathers; to its betrayal of the rights and interests of free labor and the cause of human rights at home and abroad, is now added disloyalty to the integrity of the Union. Let the intelligent patriotism of the nation rebuke this mad exhibition of folly and fanaticism, which would shiver this Union into broken fragments, and let it proclaim, in the words of Andrew Jackson, "The Federal Union must be preserved."

Aggressions of the Slave Power.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY WILSON,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN REPLY TO HON. JEFFERSON DAVIS,

Delivered in the Senate of the United States, January 26, 1860.

Mr. Wilson. Mr. President, during the past seven weeks, these halls have rung with angry menaces of disunion. Disunion has been predicted, disunion has been threatened, in the event of the triumph of the Republican party in November next. We have sat here coolly, calmly, and listened to those angry and noisy menaces. Yesterday I gathered up some of these predictions, some of these arguments, some of these threats of disunion, and presented them to the consideration of the Senate. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Davis,] with, I thought, something of sensibility, something of feeling, replied to those remarks. I know, sir, that there comes to us, from the loyal and patriotic freemen of the North, the voice of condemnation of the angry menaces which have been made in these Chambers. There come to Senators on the other side of this Chamber the imploring appeals of men who are shivering over the political graves their leaders in these halls are digging for them. Sir, I was glad to see, yesterday, when the declarations of Democratic presses and leaders were presented to their view, a degree of feeling manifested on the other side of the Chamber. Senators are beginning to feel that it is no easy task to look these Democratic measures of disloyalty to the Union in the face. I take the movement yesterday to be a premonitory symptom of retreat from positions which even the Senator from Mississippi cannot maintain. I say to the Senate and the country, that we shall now witness the retreat of the Democratic leaders from their disloyal and revolutionary positions.

The Senator from Mississippi called upon me to say why I had arraigned gentlemen here for these avowals. He charged it upon the Republican party, that, in 1856, it went off under a sectional banner, on a sectional platform, and under the lead of a sectional candidate; and, in so doing, it seceded from the Union; it adopted practical secession. Now, I have to say to that Senator, that the call for the Republican National Convention, in 1856, was addressed to all men, North and South, who concurred in the sentiments of the Republican fathers, who were opposed to the extension of slavery, and in favor of its prohibition in the Territories of the United States; and that call would have summoned Washington and Jefferson, and the men who founded the Government of the country, into the Convention. Men from the South came to that Convention, and when they returned to their homes they were denounced for their attendance, and one of them banished from his State. That Republican call invited the people who could stand on the doctrine of slavery restriction that came from the pen of Thomas Jefferson in 1784—a doctrine sanctioned and sustained by the great men of this country for two generations; a doctrine indorsed as constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1810, 1819, 1828, and in 1840; indorsed as constitutional by the Supreme Court of the State the Senator from Mississippi represents in 1818—I say, sir, that the Republican call summoned all of this class of men in America into its National Convention. The Republican party laid down principles as broad as the Union itself. It embraced the whole country, and the interests of the whole country, in its policy. It adopted no sectional creed, no sectional platform, no sectional policy, but stood upon the ancient faith of our fathers, and there it stands to day, upon an impregnable basis, where stood the men who framed the Constitution of the United States and early administered it.

So much, sir, for my right to speak as a Republican, and to rebuke the disunion avowals of men who have adopted a new creed, a new reading of the Constitution, and who threaten to pull down the columns of the Union, unless this nation accepts their new creeds and their new constructions of constitutional power. That is it. Let the country understand it. The Republican party stands upon the doctrine of Washington, Jefferson, and the men who framed the Constitution. It stands upon doctrines sanctioned by the highest judicial tribunal of the country in other and better days. The Republican party proposes nothing new, but stands by the old traditional policy. A new school, accepting the creed that came from the brain of Calhoun in 1847, now exists, and we who choose to follow the fathers rather than these new lights are threatened now with the overthrow of the Government if we do not accept their new constitutional constructions. That is the whole of it, and let the country understand it.

The Senator objected to my right to speak, because, in 1851, I attended a social festival in Boston, and made a speech at that festival. Let me say that I stand by that speech here to-day. I do not disavow a word of it. That speech is not full nor complete, and it does not report all I did say; but what is reported I stand by. In that speech I did say, then and there, to the faces of gentlemen, what I have said all my life. I disagree with those gentlemen on several points, and they know, and everybody in my State knows, that I disagree with those gentlemen in regard to their views of the Constitution, of State rights, and of the Union. I never uttered a word or dreamed a dream of hostility to the Union of these States, and I never even allowed myself to put a case of disunion even as a supposition, as a contingency. But, sir, attending that festival, on an invitation, I spoke of the fidelity of Mr. Garrison, and of those that associated with him—men who do not vote, men who hold no offices, men who will accept no offices, men that you may call fanatical, if you please, but men who in personal character, and in all the relations of private life, have the respect of all who know them. Disagreeing from these gentlemen in regard to their construction of the Constitution, I paid them the tribute of my respect for their zeal, their devotion to what they regarded to be their duty. For an oppressed and hated race these men have devoted years of self-sacrificing toil—I do not agree with them in many of their views—I differ widely from them. I do not think they have always labored wisely, but of their sincere devotion no one can doubt; and I then paid them my humble tribute of respect, and I shall not recall those words, here or elsewhere. Sir, I disagree with the Senator from Mississippi as I do with Garrison in his views of the Constitution and of the Union, but I have often, in public and in private, in my section of the country, borne the sincere tribute of my admiration of his ability, intelligence, and fidelity to his convictions.

The Senator arraigns me for having, in that speech, paid a compliment to the reformers of England, while he says I arraigned England for forcing slavery upon this continent. Why, sir, does not the Senator know that, for nearly two centuries, the party in favor of slavery and the slave trade controlled the Government of England, and shaped her policy, and that, too, against the protests, in later years, of the noblest and best intellects of England? It is not the class of men who planted slavery in America to whom I paid the tribute of my admiration. Nor is it the class of men who are upholding the course of England in India, that I regard to-day as one of the greatest crimes of this nineteenth century; for when I think of the wrongs England has perpetrated in India, I can hardly

bear that an Englishman should reproach me or reproach my country with holding any number of men in bondage. But I paid my tribute of respect to that class of men who, during this century, have abolished the slave trade; have given freedom to eight hundred thousand bondmen in the West Indies; who have carried reforms in England that have enlarged the privileges of the people; and who, to-day, are engaged in pressing upon the Government reforms that will enlarge their rights and privileges. A more devoted class of advocates of human rights the sun, in his course across the heavens, never looked down upon, than have acted in England during the present century. They have carried their reforms against hailstorms of abuse; just such abuse as is now heaped upon us on this side of the water, by men who are but repeating the words of English presses and English statesmen—of blind and fanatical conservatism.

The Senator refers to my remarks of yesterday as to the slave power; and the Senator, in this connection, does not seem to understand what I mean by the slave power. I will tell the Senator, and I will try to make him understand what I mean by it. When I speak of the slave power of this Government, I mean the political influence of slavery in the Government of the country. When the Constitution was made, there were about six hundred thousand slaves in this country. They were not, on an average, worth one hundred dollars apiece. Slavery, as an element of political power, was utterly contemptible. There were in the Constitutional Convention and in the early Government men from South Carolina and Georgia representing slave interests; but the great mass of the men representing the Southern States, especially Virginia, were men opposed to the extension of slavery, opposed to the slave trade, and openly in favor of the policy of emancipation. These six hundred thousand now have increased to four million. Their value, when the Government commenced, was estimated at forty or fifty million dollars, and it has increased to more than two thousand million. Here is a vast material interest. This interest is upheld by State law; and the result is, that men in favor of perpetuating and extending this system of slavery over this continent have obtained the control of the sovereign States of this Union. Why, sir, would Virginia send Washington to these Halls if he was living? Would Virginia send Jefferson here on the avowals he made, avowals such as have never been equaled by any statesman on this continent, against slavery? Would Virginia send Madison, and Patrick Henry, and George Mason, or men who made the declarations they made, into these Chambers now? Would Maryland send Luther Martin? Would she send William Pinkney here now to represent her sentiments? Would North Carolina send Judge Gaston and Judge Iredell—men who have left upon the record of the country their sentiments in favor of the emancipation of the bondman? No, sir, I tell you this slave power has banished from the councils of the nation not only all of that class of men, but nearly all of the old Henry Clay Whigs and the followers of Andrew Jackson, the old national men; and Congress now is made up of the disciples of Mr. Calhoun, of the men who have dethroned Jefferson as the apostle of Democracy, and enthroned Calhoun as their philosopher, guide, and friend.

Mr. MASON. Will the Senator allow me to make an inquiry, that I may learn exactly his position? Do I understand the Senator to mean by the slave power, as he expresses it, the representation of the slaves provided for by the Constitution?

Mr. WILSON. I will answer the Senator frankly; no, sir, I do not. I will tell the Senator what I do mean. I will try to make myself understood on this point. I mean the influence that results from the holding of four million men as property, valued at two or three thousand million dollars. The holding of it by law, and the desire to extend it and perpetuate it, have developed an element of political power; it is bold, arrogant, aggressive; it governs the States; it governs the Federal Government to-day.

The Senator from Mississippi wanted me to state, and he said he had called for it before, what we considered the aggressions of this slave power. Well, sir, I will endeavor to give the Senator from Mississippi some information upon this point of aggression. He seems to see none. I will state a few of those points; and if the Senator does not see slavery aggression in those points, then I think he must have come to the conclusion that slavery is imperial, and has the right and the power to do what it pleases in the Government of this country. I choose to go back only some twenty-five years. When we framed the Constitution, the people of the Free States were not responsible for the existence of slavery in their National Capital. You fixed this Capital here, on the banks of the Potomac; you accepted the slave laws of Maryland and Virginia; accepted the slave code that existed here; and here, in the National Capital, in the eyes of representatives of free men, in the face of representatives of Foreign Governments; here, in the Capital of this Democratic Republic, slavery and the slave-trade existed and flourished; and we, the people of the United States, were all responsible for the existence of slavery and the slave-trade in this District. The Federal Government has complete constitutional power in this District to govern it. The people of a portion of the country sent their petitions here, asking Congress to abolish the slave-trade and slavery. This constitutional right of petition, this right that is above the Constitution, as Caleb Cushing said on the floor of the House of Representatives—a right won by our ancestors on the battle-fields of the Old World, which they brought with them here—I say this right of petition, for seven years, in these Halls, was cloven down; yes, sir, that right was cloven down here on the floor of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. Does not the Senator from Mississippi call that an aggression upon the rights of freemen, to deny their petitions a hearing in the Halls of the Congress of the United States? This right was won after a battle of seven years against that aggressive policy of the slave power.

Then, sir, ex-President Adams presented a petition purporting to come from a few slaves; and a vote of censure was moved upon him, and the Hall of the House of Representatives rang with bitter and fiery denunciations of that venerable statesman for presenting that petition of a few poor slaves to this great nation. During those same days, when the right of petition was cloven down on this floor and in the other Hall, the mails of the United States were examined by Postmasters in the Southern States. Those mails were rifled, and in Charleston, South Carolina, they were burned, and the Postmaster-General of the United States wrote a letter in which he said he could not approve, but he would not condemn. Was not that an aggression, an outrage? Yes, sir; was it not an aggression and an outrage? Will the Senator answer?

For years, the neutrality laws of the United States, under the expanding influences of the slave power, were openly violated, and then came that question of the annexation of Texas to this Union. While that great question was pending, that was to give to this country three hundred thousand square miles of slave soil, Mr. Calhoun, the leader of the slave interests during his life, insulted the moral and religious sentiments of the people of this country by sending to France, in the face of Europe, a public document avowing that the annexation of Texas was for the purpose of strengthening slavery in the United States. Was not this aggression? Was it not an outrage upon the sentiments of men who believe slavery to be an evil, to be a wrong, that the Secretary of State should send a public document to Europe to notify the Christian and civilized world that the Republic of the United States proposed to annex a foreign nation in order to uphold and perpetuate slavery?

Then, sir, came the Mexican war, the result of that annexation, the predicted result of it; and whatever may have been the cost of life or of treasure of that great contest, the aggressive policy of slavery is responsible for it. When the territories which we acquired from Mexico came to us, the people of the free States wished to preserve them to free labor and free laboring men. The Democracy of the free States, in their Conventions, in their Legislatures, and all their Representatives in these Chambers, with two exceptions, voted for the application of the proviso prohibiting slavery to the Mexican acquisitions; but the slave power, that the Senator from Mississippi cannot comprehend, cannot see, proclaimed that, if the Democracy of the North did not abandon that position, the Democratic party of this country was to be rent asunder and destroyed; and under the iron rule of this slave power, the Democratic leaders throughout the free States changed their principles, abandoned the doctrine of continuing free the Territories of the United States that came to us free. Then, sir, California came here, asking for admission into the Union as a sovereign State. She came here robed in the garments of freedom; but the influence of slavery, the slave power, of which we are speaking, in this Chamber, held California here for months, knocking at the doors of the Union for admission. In the hour of their triumph, they gave to Texas fifty or sixty thousand square miles of territory, large enough to make a State like Virginia, and paid her $10,000,000 to take it; when, according to the words of Mr. Benton, it was but a mere claim, not an established right. General Houston raised the claim to this vast territory; but it was not acknowledged by Mexico, or established by occupation.

Texas had not established that claim, and we gave her fifty or sixty thousand square miles; and we gave her $10,000,000. That was the settlement. Then came the Fugitive Slave Law. I am not here to deny constitutional provisions; but I take it, if there be a provision in the Constitution of the United States for the rendition of fugitives, the other provisions of that Constitution, in any law that may be made, are to be carried out. There are those who believe that Fugitive Slave Law to be unconstitutional. There are those who believe the time will come when that Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, in its various provisions, will be pronounced unconstitutional by the general judgment of the nation.

Then, sir, came the repeal of the Missouri compromise; and the Senator from Mississippi has made a complaint against us as the violators of that compromise, and not the men who repealed it. What is the argument? A bargain is made; one part has all the benefits of that bargain; when the hour comes for the other to have its benefits, it is taken from them. And what is the argument of the Senator from Mississippi? It amounts to just this: we made a bargain; he and I make a bargain in regard to a special measure; he wishes to apply it to another matter; I refuse to do it; and then the Senator says, as you refuse to do that, I will break the old bargain. That is the whole of it—no more, no less.

Then, sir, following the repeal of the Missouri compromise, came the invasion of five thousand Missourians into Kansas. Was not that an aggression? They took the ballot-boxes; they elected a Legislature; they passed a slave code; they established slavery. They passed laws making it a penitentiary offence for a freeman to say that slavery did not exist there. Any Northern man who should say, in that Territory, that slavery did not exist there, was liable to two years in the penitentiary. Was not that an aggression? The same acts provided that any man who was opposed to holding slaves in the Territory of Kansas could not sit upon a jury in a case of that kind. What was done with the men who led in these lawless acts of violence and fraud in the Territory of Kansas? Clark, who murdered Barber, was in office, and has since been appointed to another office, and confirmed by the Senate. Emory, who led the band that murdered Phillips, is now in office in the Territory. Henderson, who had the control of the Delaware frauds, of which so much has been said, has held office in that Territory. Many men engaged in those acts have been upheld in office by the Government.

Then, sir, came the Lecompton Constitution. Was not that an aggression? It came to this Chamber, and, although it was known by every intelligent man in the country that it was not the will of the people of Kansas, it was pressed in these Halls for months. The attempt was made to force that Constitution upon an unwilling people, a protesting people, a people who were imploring you to reject it.

Then, sir, came the English bill, another of those measures of aggression, not only an aggression, but an insult, for it said to Kansas, "You may come into the Union as a slave State, with your present population; but if you decline to come into

the Union with your present population as a slave State, you shall not come into the Union until you have ninety-three thousand inhabitants." This was the distinction, a distinction made in that bill, that a State, with its present population, could come into the Union as a slave State, but if it would not come in as a slave State, it should stay out of the Union until it had ninety-three thousand inhabitants. The people of Kansas rejected and spurned your proposition, by ten thousand majority. That is not all. They have held a Convention; they have framed a Constitution; they now ask admission into the Union as a free State; it has gone through all the forms of law; and yet that slave power this day and this hour is managing, manœuvring to keep Kansas out of the Union this session, under a Constitution of her own making, and I expect to see that aggression triumph.

Now we have the new constitutional construction of the right of the master to carry his slaves into the Territories, and hold them there as property, under the protection of the Constitution of the United States. This is a new reading, a new doctrine, a doctrine we reject, and it is an aggressive policy. It is intended as a policy of aggression. It is not intended so much for the present as for the future. Why, sir, I find a letter written by the Senator from Alabama, [Mr. CLAY,] in which he refers to these matters, and speaks of the practical importance to the South of maintaining and upholding this doctrine of the right of the master to carry his slaves into a Territory, under the protection of the Federal Constitution, and we have before us this very resolution of the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. BROWN,] asking the Senate of the United States to pronounce upon this doctrine, and not only to accept the doctrine, but to accept its consequences, and pass a slave code for the government of slavery in all the Territories of the United States.

Sir, a few years ago we had the Ostend manifesto. That was dictated by this influence of slavery. It was a declaration that disgraced the diplomacy of the country in the face of the civilized world, and there is no American that can look the world in the face, and read that manifesto, who will not hang his head.

We have sought the acquisition of Cuba to strengthen slavery. During the last ten years we have had a balance of trade against us in Cuba of one hundred and forty or one hundred and fifty million dollars. We had the offer, five years ago, of a commercial treaty with Spain in regard to the island of Cuba. A proposition was made to Mr. Perry, stating the readiness of the Spanish Government to make commercial treaties with us; and had this Government looked at the interest of the country, instead of seeking the acquisition of that island, which we are told they would not take if it was free, they would have made a commercial treaty by which the material interests of this country would have been cared for. So it is with Mexico; so it is with Central America. The policy of the acquisition of territory for the purpose of planting slavery in it has alienated the affections of the people of this continent south of us towards us. These people now hate us and fear us, and our commercial interests with the nations south of us on this continent are, and have been, sacrificed, because it is the policy of the slave power to acquire territory in which to plant slavery. I charge that this aggressive policy, this expansive policy of the slave power, is sacrificing the material, the manufacturing, the commercial interests of this country.

There is another subject to which I wish to refer. They have a law in South Carolina, or rather a series of laws in that State, by which, when a vessel comes into the harbors of that State, if a colored inhabitant of a Northern State is on board that vessel, he shall be imprisoned, the writ of *habeas corpus* denied him, and he compelled to pay his own jail fees. In 1843, Massachusetts sent to South Carolina one of the foremost advocates and men of our State. He went to that State to have this law tested in the judicial tribunals of the country; and this law was pronounced by William Wirt to be unconstitutional. This law was pronounced by Judge Johnson, of the Supreme Court of the United States, a son of South Carolina, to be an unconstitutional law. Massachusetts sent one of the first lawyers of the country to test this question in the courts of the country, and he was forcibly expelled from that State; and to add to that indignity, a law was passed, imposing the highest penalties if any person came into that State for the purpose of obstructing this law by any legal process. Does not the Senator from Mississippi regard that as an aggression? Is it not an outrage?

Mr. HAMMOND. I do not feel disposed to interrupt the Senator, or to say anything on that subject; but, on a proper occasion, it will be very easy to show that that is perfectly warranted. We passed a police law in South Carolina for our own personal protection. Certain classes of people came there and interfered with our domestic affairs. Was it an aggression to repel them or put them under surveillance, or do what we pleased with them, while they were there? We did not bring them there. They came voluntarily.

Mr. WILSON. I shall be very glad, Mr. President, to have the Senator from South Carolina, on a fit occasion, endeavor to vindicate the policy of that law. Let me say, however, to that Senator now in passing, that when South Carolina passes laws to protect herself, she has no right to infringe upon the constitutional rights of others. If any persons go into that State and violate her laws, she will punish them. Of that I do not complain; but, sir, what right has South Carolina to pass an act that colored citizens of Massachusetts, when they go into the harbor of Charleston, who are innocent of crime, shall, merely because they happen to be colored men, be taken and imprisoned before they commit any offence?

Mr. HAMMOND. All this grows out of the peculiar differences in the domestic institutions of the North and the South. Different laws must be made, to suit different countries and different systems. Colored people are not citizens in South Carolina. We cannot recognize them either as citizens of South Carolina or citizens of Massachusetts; and the Supreme Court has since decided that they are not citizens of the United States. They are therefore not entitled to the constitutional provision that places the citizens of the different States on an equality within each other's limits. We had reason to believe that it was dangerous to the peace of our community and to our peculiar institutions, to permit them to come there. Let me say again, that all this grows out of what the Senators on the other side do not seem at all to comprehend; that we live under distinctly different social systems, and must have peculiar laws. Without intending to aggress upon anybody else, or to infringe on the rights of any individual, much less of any State or of any section, we must be allowed to take care of ourselves. That law to which the Senator alludes has been materially modified. It has been ascertained that it was unnecessarily severe, and instead of incarcerating the colored persons in jail, they are now kept under surveillance, perhaps allowed to stay on their vessels; I do not recollect the exact modification, but they are no longer subject to the same impositions they were before. This South Carolina has done voluntarily; and thus South Carolina and all the South would ameliorate the condition of the slaves, if they were let alone. It has been done. They are ameliorating it; and we could go on to a greater degree, if we were let alone.

Mr. WILSON. The Senator says they live under different social systems, and they must have their way of protecting themselves. Well, sir, I am willing that they shall protect themselves; but in protecting themselves, I say they have no right to infringe on the rights of others. What are we to think of a social system that requires this sacrifice of the rights of others?

Mr. CHESNUT. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts, that the ground we assume in South Carolina on that point, the ground which has been sustained by the courts, is that every State has a constitutional right to pass such police laws as will protect itself against any trouble. You pass your police laws in New York and in every seaport town in the country; you quarantine vessels, you raise all sorts of barriers of protection against evils which you anticipate. Now, in South Carolina we have the same right, and it has been so decided by the courts, under the rule of police regulations, to protect ourselves against interference with our rights and interests by the Senator from Massachusetts and his people. I put it upon the broad principle that he has no right to claim for a negro from Massachusetts, or for a negro from elsewhere, that he shall become his emissary under the pretended rights guarantied by the Constitution to the citizens of this country—that he shall insinuate him upon us under any such pretence. We claim that as a right of sovereignty belonging to all free people, the right of self-protection by police regulations and otherwise.

Mr. WILSON. I want to call the attention of the Senators from South Carolina to the precise and exact issue. In Massachusetts, and in several of our States, the colored men are regarded, and ever have been regarded, as citizens. They have all the rights of citizens. They fought the battles of the Revolution. They help to make the laws; they obey the laws. In 1820, South Carolina passed this act. William Wirt, then Attorney-General of the United States, pronounced it unconstitutional. At that time, Judge Johnson, of South Carolina, was on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States, and he pronounced it unconstitutional. Under these circumstances, men were imprisoned, were punished, and some of them, sold into slavery. Massachusetts sent a lawyer to South Carolina; to do what? To take that case before the judicial tribunals to be pronounced upon.

Mr. HAMMOND. If the Senator will allow me to say one word more, I shall have done.

Mr. WILSON. Certainly.

Mr. HAMMOND. It so happens that I was Governor of the State when Mr. Hoar came. I had known him before in Congress, and he had often avowed to me that he was not an abolitionist. He was a pleasant, kind old gentleman, well informed, and I had a sort of friendship for him during the short time that I sat near him in Congress. He came, and sent me his commission under the broad seal of the State of Massachusetts. Knowing that perhaps there might be some violence done, I took care that no violence should be done towards him; and although he was, as you may say, ejected from the State, he was only told the situation and circumstances of affairs, and politely asked, and escorted by some of the first gentlemen of Charleston to the boat. Why did Massachusetts send us a commissioner but for an incendiary purpose? If she wished to try the constitutionality of that law, she could have got lawyers enough in Charleston.

Mr. WILSON. She tried.

Mr. HAMMOND. Well, then, if she could not get a lawyer there, she ought to have known that the state of public feeling was such that sending a commissioner there was an act of aggression; and what right had she to send a commissioner there to produce an abolition excitement in the city of Charleston?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I am very glad of the opportunity we have here to-day from South Carolina in regard to this law——

Mr. HAMMOND. I am not at all aware of the fact that she could not get a lawer there. I doubt very much whether it is so. She could not have tried all the lawyers. There are lawyers enough now who would do it, and I believe always were.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, South Carolina has a law, passed when that Senator was Governor, making it an offence against the law to act as counsel in such a case. I have the law before me.

Mr. HAMMOND. That was after this.

Mr. WILSON. It was.

Mr. HAMMOND. And in consequence of it.

Mr. WILSON. Now, Mr. President, let us understand each other. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. CHESNUT] says that this excitement in 1844 was owing to the aggressions of Massachusetts on South Carolina. What aggressions?

Mr. CHESNUT. Shall I answer.

Mr. WILSON. Certainly.

Mr. CHESNUT. Why, sir, the aggressions were of the most palpable and continual character, by the people of Massachusetts, by the citizens of Massachusetts, by the abolitionists of Massachusetts. I suppose the new Republican party, under its rebaptismal name, had not appeared; but Garri-

son, that teacher at whose font the gentleman was baptized in his ideas of liberty—a man whose opinion of the Constitution of the country is, that it is a league with death and a covenant with hell—that very teacher from whom the gentleman, as appeared from what was read here yesterday, had taken his lessons of patriotism, of devotion to the country and to liberty: that very man, and all his class, had been exciting the people, sending abolition emissaries, distributing abolition documents to us. That was the aggression of the citizens of Massachusetts, which the people of South Carolina had a right to protect themselves against.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, the Senator rose for the purpose of telling me what aggressions had been perpetrated upon his own State, and he states no aggression; he has none to state. The people of Massachusetts never made an aggression on the people of South Carolina to this hour, and that Senator cannot put his finger on a solitary one. I defy him to do it, I say here, to-day, to that Senator, that he has not, and the men whom he associates with never have, produced the shadow of evidence that any such attempt was ever made by the citizens of Massachusetts to incite slaves to insurrection in South Carolina, at any time, or on any occasion. Before he makes that declaration again, I ask him to give us one fact, one well-authenticated fact.

But the other Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMMOND] complains that we sent this agent, because we might have employed lawyers in Charleston. I say to that Senator, that Massachusetts did endeavor to engage lawyers in Charleston to take this case, but she could not obtain a lawyer in Charleston to test the case; and we sent Mr. Hoar to South Carolina to try the case, and South Carolina would not allow him to take that case into court. She passed a law that one of her most distinguished men on the bench of the Supreme Court pronounced unconstitutional. Massachusetts wished to test it, and sent a lawyer there when she could not obtain one in the State. The one she sent was driven from the State, and then a law was passed making it a penitentiary offence to come there and try that matter again, and making it an offence for a South Carolina lawyer to take a case of the kind.

On the 18th December, 1844, the Legislature of South Carolina passed a law to prevent any person thereafter coming into the State for the purpose, or any attorney or other person in the State, from instituting any proceeding that should test the constitutionality of her law of 1820, which imprisoned and sold into perpetual slavery the free colored persons of the North coming into the State in merchant vessels or otherwise; visiting any such person with the most fearful penalties.

The first section of the law enacted, among other things, that if any person, on his own behalf, or in virtue of any authority from any State, should come within the limits of South Carolina with intent to counteract or hinder the operation of such laws as have been made in relation to slaves OR FREE PERSONS OF COLOR, he shall, on conviction, be sentenced to banishment, AND TO SUCH FINE AND IMPRISONMENT AS MAY BE DEEMED FITTING BY THE COURT WHICH SHALL HAVE TRIED THE OFFENCE; that is, FOR LIFE, if the court please.

The second section enacts, among other things, that if any person within the State shall accept any commission or authority from any other State, and shall do anything to counteract or hinder the operation of such laws, he shall, on conviction, be sentenced to pay for the first offence a fine not exceeding $1,000, and be imprisoned not exceeding one year; and for the second offence, he shall be imprisoned for seven years, and pay a like fine, or be banished from the State, in the discretion of the court.

The third section enacts that the Governor shall require any person coming into South Carolina on his own behalf, or for any State, FOR ANY PURPOSE "having relation to the laws or regulations of this State on the subject of slaves or free persons of color," to depart from the limits of the State in forty-eight hours, on pain of banishment from the State, *and* fine and imprisonment AT THE DISCRETION of the court.

The fourth section enacts, among other things, that a second offence against the third section *shall* be punished by an imprisonment not less than seven years, and by fine not less than $1,000, and banishment.

On the same day, the same State enacted a law taking away all benefits, privileges, or rights, under the writ of *habeas corpus*, from "every negro or free person of color who shall enter this State on board any vessel, as a cook, steward, or mariner, or in any other employment on board such vessel."

Sir, they have a law in the State of Virginia authorizing the officers of that State to go on board vessels, and charge the commander five dollars for making the examination. They have an institution in Virginia that her Senator [Mr. MASON] tells us "ennobles the white man and the black man;" but they have got a class in the community, the negroes, who, somehow or other, do not like that kind of nobility, and they try to run away from this ennobling system; and so they try to hide themselves, it is said, on board vessels, and suffer all the inconveniences of a long passage, in order to escape from this system that ennobles them, and then the officers charge five dollars for making the examination; and if a vessel sails out of Baltimore, and passing by the coast of Virginia is prevented by head winds from continuing her journey, a vessel that goes into the harbors of Virginia only to anchor, is visited and charged five dollars.

Mr. MASON. Will the Senator allow me one moment?

Mr. WILSON. Certainly.

Mr. MASON. I have not looked back at my language on the occasion referred to; but I think I am in the habit of using language that is appropriate. I did not, I am certain, use the term "ennoble" in that connection, only because it would have been unmeaning. I presume I said—what I meant to say, and here repeat—that the experience of the Southern States has shown that the condition of African bondage elevates both races. Now, sir, as to this law, I cannot give the honorable Senator any specific instances, because I have not treasured them up; but the honorable Senator knows enough of the cotemporaneous history of the country to know that coasting vessels along the Chesapeake Bay have more than once stolen, secreted, and carried away the slaves of the proprietors upon its shores. It was to prevent that, that the State of Virginia, with full power and a perfect right, passed that police law appointing a set of officers, whose duty it is to examine every coasting vessel, and see that she has not kidnapped any of our slaves; and the fee—I do not know what it is, five dollars probably, or whatever it is—I take it for granted is paid by those whose misfortune subjects them to that surveillance. It is a police law of the State; and whether the State has a right to pass it or not, is a matter which the State will determine for itself and by itself.

Mr. WILSON. A word about the Senator's language. I happened to hear it, and I find it here before me. He said:

"The South had been led to examine the subject because of the abolition agitation; and it is now almost universally believed that the best condition of the African race is the one they are now subjected to in the South, and that it is ennobling to both races, white and black."

Mr. MASON. Will the Senator tell me where he got that report?

Mr. WILSON. I cannot; but it is correct, for I heard it.

Mr. MASON. I will not appeal to any Senator; but I will ask whether it is possible, knowing something of the use of terms, that I could have applied that term to the black race—that it ennobled them?

Mr. CLARK. I desire to say, for one, that I distinctly heard it, and other Senators around me did.

Mr. MASON. Then I will not say that I did not use it; but I think, if I did, I must have been very unfortunate in the use of terms. The meaning was "elevate."

Mr. CLARK. I will say to the Senator that we at the time thought it very singular that the term should be used, and it caused some remark among us.

Mr. MASON. It was a mistake of terms. I do not remember the occasion; but the proper term is "elevate."

Mr. WILSON. Why should a law of that kind be imposed on those who have committed no offence? Why should Virginia not pay her own police officers? Why should they board vessels sailing from Baltimore, who are sent in by stress of weather, and tax them five dollars for making this examination? But the Senator says it is a policy of their own. I believe it to be an unconstitutional act. At any rate, I know it to be an unjust and unfair one; and I put that act among the other acts of aggression that the people of this country are subjected to by the slave system. No right, no interest, can stand for a moment, when the interests of slavery are involved.

Sir, what are the facts before the country to-day? Is it not true that men are arrested in many of the Southern States who are travelling upon their business? that laboring men are arrested, insulted, and punished? that men are banished from their hearths and homes? that laws are being passed to sell colored men into slavery unless they leave their native States? Has not Arkansas passed an act of that character? Has not such an act just been arrested by the veto of the Governor of Missouri? Has not Judge Catron denounced those laws as a proposition to work an oppression and outrage? To-day, in the Southern States of this Union, our mails may be opened. Is a Senator on this side of the Chamber safe in nearly half the States of this Union? I say to you, to-day, what Senators around me will bear witness to, that our franks are not safe in many of the States of this Union. Is not this a violation of the right of free speech, the right of freedom of the press, and a violation of the sanctity of the mails? Are not these aggressions upon the rights of American citizens? Are they not the grossest aggressions—aggressions that would mark any Government on earth where they existed as a despotism?

But, sir, the Senator from Mississippi said, in the course of his remarks, that, when I referred to the passage of a slave-code in New Mexico, I said what I could not have known to be the case. I have the letter of the Delegate of that Territory, and it reads:

"At the solicitation of General R. DAVIS, of Mississippi, I now write you, requesting you to draw up a law for the protection of property in slaves in New Mexico, and cause it to be passed by our Legislature."

Then the request is, that this law, when passed, shall be sent to the Southern newspapers, and sent very quickly to the New York *Herald*. This letter is addressed by the Delegate from New Mexico to the Secretary of that Territory, requesting him to draw up and pass such a law, and this at the request of General R. DAVIS, of Mississippi.

But the Senator from Mississippi suggested that the Northern Democracy, in case we have a contest, will, in the language of General Cushing, "throttle" us in our own States. Now, sir, I should like to have an understanding on this subject. I want to know from the Senator from Mississippi, whether, in the event of the happening of the contingency to which certain Senators look, the election of a Republican President, and an attempt is made to go out of the Union, or, rather, following the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina, to stay here, and hold on to the Capitol, to engage in a bloody struggle, he is authorized to speak for the Democracy of my State, and say they will sustain him and the gentlemen with whom he acts? Have they authorized him to speak for them, and to answer his friends that they will "throttle us where we stand?"

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator asks me a question, and, if he wishes me to answer it now, I will answer it, of course. I suppose he could hardly have expected any other answer than that which I must necessarily give, that I have no authority to speak for the Democracy of Massachusetts. It seems to be almost a superfluous question. My reference to General Cushing was to an expression which he used in a speech made and published in Massachusetts, and I considered him very good authority for those of whom he spoke.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, General Cushing is very good authority for himself at the time he makes a declaration. He came to these Halls about twenty-five years ago, and he made the House of Representatives ring with his eloquence against what he was pleased to call the aggressions of the South; and whenever Massachusetts was assailed—and she was assailed

then as she is now—he came to her defence. When she was taunted with love of liberty, he said he gloried in it, for anti-slavery was but the synonym for love of liberty. General Cushing has seen fit to change his views, and at the present time he is certainly the greatest agitator we have in New England, making speeches remarkable for their intemperate zeal, writing the most singular letters, some of which I have before me; and I must confess my utter amazement that a gentleman of the very large intelligence of General Cushing should pen letters of such an inflammatory and ridiculous character. This phrase, "throttle us," is one of his imprudent declarations, which only excite the amusement of the people in Massachusetts.

But, sir, this is not the first time this idea has been thrown out during these debates, that the Democracy of the North will take care of us if such a contest should arise. I should like to know whether the Democratic Senators and Representatives from the North will rise in their places here, and say that, in the event of the election in November next to the Presidency of the Senator from New York [Mr. SEWARD], or the Senator from Maine [Mr. FESSENDEN], or any other of the Senators about me, or any of the public men who are the accepted leaders of the Republican party, the administration will not be permitted to come into power, and the Union be dissolved? I want to know if those Senators are ready to pledge the support of the Northern Democrats to that policy? If so, I should like to have them put the assurance upon the records of the Senate. Do the Democratic Senators from the North intend to aid those who are now menacing the Union? Sir, if Democratic Senators from the loyal North and West intend to give aid to those who are now menacing the unity of the Republic, if the Representatives of the Northern Democracy in these Chambers have given assurances that when the contest comes, if come it must, for the preservation of that Union which makes us one people, they will throttle us in our tracks, let them now put their intentions upon the records of the country. Let them speak for themselves.

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS.

FOR THE CAMPAIGN OF 1860.

No. 1.

SPEECH OF WILLIAM H. SEWARD—The Irrepressible Conflict—Delivered at Rochester, Monday, October 25, 1858—Together with Charles O'Conor's Speech, delivered at the Union Meeting in New York city, December 19, 1859.—Price, per single copy, (including both Speeches,) 2 cents; per dozen copies, 20 cents; per hundred, $1; per thousand, $8.

No. 2.

SENATOR SEWARD'S GREAT SPEECH—Freedom and The Union—Delivered February 29, 1860, in the Senate of the United States.—Price, per single copy, 2 cents; per dozen copies, 20 cents; per hundred, $1; per thousand, $8.

No. 3.

SPEECHES OF HON. HENRY WILSON, of Massachusetts—Democratic Leaders for Disunion—Delivered in the Senate of the United States, January 25 and 26, 1860.—Price, per single copy, (including both Speeches,) 2 cents; per dozen copies, 20 cents; per hundred, $1; per thousand, $8.

No. 4.

SPEECH OF HON. S. H. HAMMOND—Freedom National, Slavery Sectional—In Vindication of the Principles of the Republican Party, delivered in the Senate of the State of New York, February, 1860.—Price, per single copy, 2 cents; per dozen copies, 20 cents; per hundred, $1; per thousand, $8.

No. 5.

SPEECH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN, of Illinois.—National Politics.—Delivered at the Cooper Institute, February 27, 1860.—Together with the Speech of Senator Doolittle, of Wisconsin.—State Rights and the Supreme Court—Delivered in the United States Senate, February 24, 1860.—Price per single copy (including both Speeches), 2 cents; per dozen copies, 20 cents; per hundred, $1; per thousand, $8.

EVENING JOURNAL ALMANAC FOR 1860—Containing Election Returns of all the States, and Returns by Election Districts of the State of New York, with a large amount of other Political Statistics.—Price, $7 per hundred.

REGISTRY BOOKS, FOR INSPECTORS OF ELECTION—Indispensable for a correct Registry.—Price (including Poll Lists) $3 per dozen.

☞ Address, for either of the above,

WEED, PARSONS & COMPANY, 59 State St., Albany.

ALBANY JOURNAL FOR THE CAMPAIGN, SIX MONTHS.

Ten copies, to one address,	$5 00	Fifty copies, to one address,	$18 00
Twenty copies, to one address,	8 00	One hundred copies, to one address,	35 00

DAILY JOURNAL—At the rate of $7 per annum.

SEMI-WEEKLY JOURNAL—At the rate of $3 per annum, in advance.

☞ Address,

WEED, DAWSON & COMPANY, 59 State Street, Albany.

Albany, February, 1860.

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS.—No. 4.

FREEDOM NATIONAL—SLAVERY SECTIONAL

SPEECH

OF THE

HON. S. H. HAMMOND,

OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH SENATE DISTRICT,

ON THE

GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE.

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY, 1860.

ALBANY:
WEED, PARSONS & CO., PRINTERS AND STEREOTYPERS.
1860.

☞ FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF THE ALBANY EVENING JOURNAL. PRICE, PER SINGLE COPY, 2c.; PER DOZEN COPIES, 20c.; PER HUNDRRD, $1; PER THOUSAND, $8.

SPEECH

OF THE

HON. S. H. HAMMOND,

OF THE

TWENTY-SEVENTH SENATE DISTRICT.

IN SENATE—FEBRUARY, 1860.

Senator LAWRENCE, of the 1st District, having spoken against the position taken by the Governor in his Annual Message, on the subject of Slavery,

Mr. HAMMOND replied as follows:

I thank the Senator from the 1st for bringing the subject of our federal relations before the Senate. By federal relations, sir, I mean the relations between the States and the people of the several States. I thank him for the broad range he has taken in this discussion; and while the difference between us is world-wide, I can do justice to the ability if not the good taste of his effort. And yet, sir, I had hoped that this irrepressible conflict would not have been precipitated upon us here during the present session. But it is our destiny to encounter it everywhere. It is above, beneath and around us; and, sir, since come it must, I again thank the gentleman for ushering it in. Take notice, sir, and let it be recorded for reference, that this slavery agitation has not been introduced here by republicans. The call of the clans has been sounded by democratic bugles; the first blow has come from democratic hands. Let no man, then, charge us as being the agitators.

Sir, perhaps it is best that this great question between freedom and slavery should be discussed on this floor, and at this time. It is in the hearts of the people everywhere. It goes ringing from the Gulf to the great lakes—from the rock-bound coast of New England across the continent, to mingle with the sound of the waves that lave the Pacific coast. Sir, there is some fear, some danger in this agitation; but there is vastly more of hope. We can look through the mist and cloud that hangs over this confederacy to-day, and see in the future a strength as enduring, a progress as matchless, as in the past. Nations, sir, have their ague-chills, and we are suffering one of the paroxisms that belong to ours. But there is in this young country a recuperative power, a constitutional vigor, so to speak, that will carry us safely through; and though to-day may be one of darkness and storm, the glory of the sunlight will be all over the earth again to-morrow.

Time was, sir, when we said there was no North, no South, no East, no West. That time has passed away. The East and the West have drifted to the North, and the North and the South have grown to be gigantic antagonisms, rearing their vast proportions against each other in a hostility that threatens the upheaval of the Union, and, strange as it will sound in history, a hostility based upon a fundamental difference on the great question of human liberty. Strange, sir, is it not, that in this free country—the freest, most progressive and prosperous in the round world, surrounded and protected by more guaranties of freedom, more safeguards against tyranny, where human genius has the widest range, human enterprise the broadest scope, and human energy the fewest obstacles in the way of its progress of any nation under the whole heavens, having too a glorious history made up of trials heroically endured, and triumphs gloriously won, —that even this great republic should, in the midst of its career of prosperity and progress, be in danger of being wrecked by a conflict having for its object the perpetuation and spread, on the one hand, and the limitation, on the other, of human slavery!—that the free people of this free country should be ready to clutch each other's throats over the mightiest oppression that the sun or the stars ever shone upon!

I said, that perhaps it is well to discuss this great question in this chamber, and at this time. What we may say here will go out to the world as in some measure the sentiments and opinions of the people of this great State whom we represent. Sir, there is need of a truthful representation of those sentiments and opinions, that the people of other States may know the strength

and volume of that current in favor of free thought, free institutions, free labor, and free soil, that is sweeping over the greatest in this great confederation of States. Sir, it is time that the truth should be spoken. It is time that the calumny of our opponents, in our own and other States, who have maligned the people of New York, should be refuted by a calm but firm and frank avowal of a sentiment that pervades all hearts in this free State. Sir, I care not what Democracy may say, speaking through its organs. I care not what demagogues may say, on this floor or elsewhere. I care not what your professional orators, your learned lawyers, whose sympathies have been dried up by delving among the dust and rubbish of ancient and the more brilliant sophisms of modern laws, may say on this subject. I speak, sir, what you and I do know, that in this State the love of freedom and hatred of oppression, whatever shape it may assume, is organic in the hearts of our people, as pervading as the air we breathe, as universal as the light by day or the darkness by night. Sir, I speak not now of political parties, nor of political organizations. I speak of the people, and of the whole people. They love freedom, and hate oppression and wrong. They love freedom and hate slavery; and that man, reared and educated in this State, is false to himself, recreant to the impulses of his own heart, a traitor to his own instincts, who denies this living fact. On this great fundamental principle, all are agreed; and though we may wrangle over the manner of manifesting our love of freedom and hatred of slavery, still the fact remains, and the world, our sister States, should be made to understand it. On this question, the popular mind is made up. Argument is thrown away upon us. We have gone back to first principles, and taken our stand on the side of Christianity, on the side of progress, on the side of civilization, and in defence of human rights. Calumny will not move us; denunciation, threats, will not intimidate us. The spirit of the age, the popular sentiment throughout the world, is with us. The differences between the people of this State and the propagandists of human slavery, those who would make it an outspreading and progressive institution, are wide as the poles, deep as the foundations of right, and eternal as God. I repeat, sir, I am not now speaking of the Republican Party, but of the People. I speak not the sentiment of myself or my political associates alone, but of a sentiment that nestles in the heart of every man. Even the Senator from the 1st, with all his professions of nationality, all his party subserviency to the interests of Slavery, notwithstanding his association with the mouthing patriotism that is shaped by cotton bales and burrows in the sweetness of hogsheads of sugar, even my friend has not been able wholly to crush the divinity that stirs within him. Even he has been compelled to yield a tribute, cold and reluctant and unwilling to be sure, but still a tribute to that sentiment in favor of free institutions which is welling up all over the State.

But, Sir, it is one thing to have the humanity to feel, and another the courage to express the sentiment that is in us. It is one thing to *know* the right, and another to possess the boldness to do it. I have said, Sir, that this sentiment in favor of freedom is universal throughout the north; but, Sir, it shames me to say, that there are craven spirits who cowed by the arrogant pretension of the domineering propagandists of human slavery, and under the lash of party drill, meanly suppress the instincts of their nature, and stultify their own convictions of right

> "For so much trash as a man may grasp thus."

Sir, I can respect a man who has been educated in the midst of Slavery, who has grown up under the influence, imbibed the sentiments, and become familiarized with that absolutism, which is the fundamental principle of a slave code. I can respect such a man as an apologist for the existence of slave institutions. I can excuse him for advocating their extension. I can forgive him, even though he insists, that it is not wrong to buy and sell men; but, Sir, I have no charity for, I cannot fellowship, the man who, in these times of enlightenment, and in this free State, with the light of discussion blazing all around him, with freedom to talk, freedom to reason, freedom to think upon this great subject, meanly suppresses his convictions, speaking with bated breath and walking with a cringing gait; surrendering in coward fear his manhood; bartering his birthright of independence; his heritage of freedom for a mess of pottage, compared with which, that for which Esau sold his birthrigh was a monarch's feast. Sir, I can respect a slaveholder; there are honorable men, patriotic men, Christian men among them. Men who are conscientious in their pro-slavery faith; but, sir, language fails to express my measureless scorn of a northern doughface. Let no man accuse me now of using language unbecoming this place. We have heard three hundred thousand voting men, citizens of our State, men to the manner of freedom born, denounced as traitors. We have heard ourselves maligned, the Republican Party of this State, and all the North, denounced as traitors and rebels to the constitution. We have listened calmly to this gigantic lie (pardon the use of this strong old Saxon word), reaching through an hour of forensic essay; and are we to choose our words, to select gentle phrases, when we hurl back this stupendous calumny upon our traducers.

But, sir, let us go back to the subject of this discussion. I said, that the sentiment in favor of free institutions pervaded all the North. That it was in the heart of every man in whom was a living soul. True, there are those who in coward fear, close their lips against the utterance of the thought that is in them. True, there are others who, in their craven dread of party drill, the sneer of demagogues, or their greed for official spoil, deny or seek to pervert this ennobling sentiment, who

> "Bend the pregnant hinges of the knee,
> That thrift may follow fawning."

But, sir, that sentiment is in the hearts of all, and it will not be clean crushed ont.

Sir, it is this love of free institutions, of free thought, free speech, free discussion, free labor and free soil; of making freedom and the spread of free institutions, the leading feature of the policy of this great republic, that form the foundation stones and the strong pillars of the Republican Party. Sir, that party was not an accident. It was not the work of intriguants. It was not the creation of politicians. It was a necessity growing out of the exigencies of the times. It was a logical sequence of the genius

and spirit of the age. It was more, even than this. It was but the carrying out to their remote but inevitable results, those principles which underlaid our Revolution itself. The spirit, sir, that moved our fathers to break the yoke of kings; that proclaimed that all men were by nature free; that they were endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which were life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness, was not a MYTH, but a living, and immortal entity. However it may have slumbered in the past, it became flesh and dwelt among us. The great truths which that spirit dictated, and which were embodied in our Declaration of Independence, were not metaphysical abstractions, were not "glittering generalities," but living and everlasting facts. They were more than mere profession—they were articles of living faith; and as intelligence increased, and the value of freedom developed itself, these great truths have grown into a higher appreciation, and received a deeper sanction.

They teach us, sir, the value of human rights, and they rouse us to a hatred of oppression and wrong. They teach us to estimate the value of a man, not in dollars and cents, not by the price he will bring in market, but because he is a man, wearing the image and stamped with the signet of the Almighty, having within him a reasoning spirit and a soul that is immortal.

Sir, these great truths have a practical and irresistible influence over human progress, and they have been moving us forward for generations. They are gathering force and volume always. They created the necessity for, and then fashioned the Republican Party. Call it, if you please, the fragments of pre-existing parties. Be it so. Those parties were shivered by collision with these great truths. Call it, if you please, the shattered remains of old political organizations. Be it so. It was these great truths that destroyed the cohesiveness of those old organizations. These great truths, sir, had a mission of destruction as well as of reconstruction—to kill as well as to make alive. They destroyed pre-existing parties, to collect the scattered fragments and breathe into them new and immortal life. They killed the old political organizations to make alive a new one, that should be purged of moral cowardice, and have the courage to stand up boldly and always for the right.

Sir, in the heat of discussion great men often use expressions which, though uttered without premeditation, are so pregnant with meaning, so full of philosophy, so in accordance with the genius of the age, that the people take them up, and convert them into proverbs.

It was thus, sir, with Mr. Seward, when he used the expression which the Senator from the first repeated with a sneer, and which now goes ringing from Maine to Texas, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. There was nothing new in the idea. It was the same conflict that has been waging since history lifted the curtain from the everlasting past. A conflict old as human traditions. The conflict between right and wrong—between human rights and imperial sway—between freedom and oppression. It was this "irresistible conflict" which impelled the sturdy barons of England, with sharp swords in their hands, to force Magna Charta from King John. It was this same irrepressible conflict that sent the Mayflower bounding over the ocean, with her pilgrim exiles seeking a refuge and a home in a wilderness country beyond the reach of the oppressor's arm. It was this irrepressible conflict that gave this great republic a place among the nations of the earth, and made us, the people of these States, free, independent, self-governing and self-governed men. It falsified the traditions of old, bearded and hoary with age as they were, that self-government was a delusion, and republican rule a fable. Sir, it was this same irrepressible conflict, eternal in the past, as it will be in the future, between right and wrong, between freedom and oppression, between progress into a broader and better light and retrogression that created the necessity for a Republican Party, that gave it vitality, power, triumph.

It is this same irrepressible conflict that will carry this party forward to greater power and a more enduring triumph.

Sir, I heard the Senator from the first prophecy its downfall. It is not the first prediction of a lying prophet that has been or will be falsified by the logic of time. Democracy has more than once foretold its destruction, even when itself went down before the sweep of its battle-axe. It still lives, and will continue to live till its great mission shall have been accomplished; and woe to the puny spoilsman, woe to the banner-men of slavery, woe to the mouthing demagogues who for the sake of a selfish and groveling ambition would sow discord between the States, and scatter strife where all should be peace. They will be before it like chaff before the tempest. They will be under its feet like straw upon the threshing floor.

Sir, this Republican Party loves freedom and intends to maintain it. It loves free territory and intends to protect it. It is in everlasting hostility to human slavery, and it intends to avow, and does avow it always. But, sir, it loves the Constitution and the Union, and intends to regard all the sanctions of the one and be firm in its loyalty to the other. It not only intends to observe all the sanctions of the Constitution, but intends that others shall be made to regard them too. It loves the Union, and is resolved that its strong arm shall sustain and preserve it. It loves the rights of the States, and intends to sustain them. It loves State sovereignty, and intends to perpetuate it.

Sir, on this great issue of slavery it is frank and free of speech, while it will be firm and impregnable in action. It is accused of interfering with the domestic institutions of the States. It is false. It is accused of interfering with the rights of the citizens of other States. It is false. It is accused of encouraging invasion of other States. It is false. It is accused of inciting insurrection and a servile war in other States. It is false—ten thousand times false—and he is recreant alike to justice, to patriotism, and to truth, who utters the infamous calumny.

Sir, the Republican Party recognizes the right of every State, from the hour of its admission into the Union, to establish or abolish slavery within its own domain, and it denies that any power on earth outside of such State has any right to interfere. The Republican Party regards slavery as a State institution, and is ready to protect it within the States, against invasion from any quarter. When danger shall threaten a slave State, whether through invasion from with-

out or rebellion within, the Republican party of the State of New York will be prompt in its aid of money and men to assist her.

The Republican Party of the State of New York makes the sovereignty of the States a fundamental article in its creed. It will be found even with the foremost when that sovereignty shall be in danger, whether that danger assail South Carolina or New York. It regards State sovereignty, and that in no restricted sense, as the palladium of our liberties. As a State, we have the exclusive power over the subject of slavery within our own borders. We can establish it or abolish it as and when we please, and no human power has any right to interfere with us. We will permit no human power to interfere with us; and what the Republican Party claims for itself in our own State, it accords in a spirit of cheerful and earnest frankness to every other State. If Virginia chooses to perpetuate slavery in her own domain, that, sir, is her business, and not ours; and hers is all the glory and all the shame of the policy she chooses to pursue. We have no right, and no disposition, to interfere in dictating her course or coercing her policy. No Republican has ever proposed to interfere with her. It is false, sir, wickedly false, that the Republican Party, or any member of it, has ever proposed to do so. There are madmen, frantic zealots in all countries, and they have existed in all ages. You will find them at the South, frenzied in their zeal for slavery and mad for a dissolution of the Union. These, sir, nestle in the bosom of Democracy, and find no word or sign of repulsion. You will find them at the North, frenzied in their zeal against slavery; but, sir, they do not affiliate with Republicanism. They are meteors skiving through the political heavens, having no orbit, belonging to no system, flashing out of the gloom only to disappear again into the darkness.

Sir, will the Senator from the 1st go further than this in the protection of State rights or in vindication of State sovereignty? Will he ask the Republican Party to go further in that direction? Sir, I said the Republican Party loved freedom and hates slavery; and frankness demands the avowal that, while it regards slavery as a State institution, and is ready to protect it there, it will never consent that it shall spread one inch beyond the boundary of the States. It will never consent that one inch of territory now free shall be surrendered to its sway, or that its shadow shall ever darken one foot of the national domain. It will never consent that soil once consecrated to freedom shall be desecrated by the footprint of a slave. It will never consent to the acquisition of another acre of slave territory, whether by conquest or by purchase. It will never consent to the admission of another slave State into the Union, otherwise than as such State may be made by a division of Texas into two or more States. This, sir, is the Republican creed, as I understand it, upon the subject of slavery. Upon this ground the Republican Party will stand in 1860, and from which it can neither be persuaded nor driven. If defeated in 1860, it will stand there in 1864, and in 1868, and in 1872, and always, until this great conflict shall have ended by the triumph or annihilation of freedom.

Sir, like the Democracy of the South, we repudiate the Douglas idea of Squatter Sovereignty; and my friend from the 1st may as well make up his mind that *his* theory on this subject is a doomed theory. The South repudiates it, and the North repudiates it. Freedom repudiates it, and Slavery repudiates it; and between these opposing forces, the plastic Doughfaces who sustain it will be squeezed into political annihilation. The Republican Party, sir, holds with the Governor that the Territories are under the rule of Congress, and must continue to remain so until they enter the Union as States.

Such, sir, is the simple creed of the Republican Party, in its great and essential features. But there are other opinions which it holds. It holds that slavery is and can be the creature only of positive law. The relation of master and slave, is one sanctioned by no natural law. It is opposed to all sound philosophy of human government and human right. It can exist only by the rule of the strongest; and its foundations rest upon that axiom of tyrants, that might makes right. We hold, that by the common law of the world, no man can hold property in man. *That* property, sir, can only be acquired by legislative enactment. Hence; there can be no slavery without a statute creating and establishing it; and hence again, there can be no slavery in the territories, unless it shall be established there by a law of Congress. You may be sure, sir, that no such law can ever be passed, while the Republican Party has a voice that shall influence the national councils.

And now, sir, will my friend from the first, tell me which article of the Republican creed is in violation of the Constitution? Will he point me to the clause with which it is in conflict? Sir, I desire to keep on constitutional grounds. Much as I hate slavery, I love the Constitution more. I desire to be enlightened as to my constitutional duties, and the constitutional rights of my fellow-citizens, with whom I may differ on this great question, involving the prosperity and progress of our common country. Sir, I do not want assertion. I want the book, the article and the section, that I may read and study it. We have plenty of assertion, plenty of dictation, plenty of blustering, and plenty of assumption of wisdom about the constitutional rights of slavery. I am sick and tired of all this. I want the article and the section.

Are we asked, sir, why the political contest of the times, have been narrowed down to this issue between freedom and slavery; between the progress of free institutions and the progress of slave institutions? I answer, that it has been impossible to avoid it. The irrepressible conflict is our destiny, and it is upon us now. The issues that divided the old parties have passed away. They were ephemeral in their nature, so far as they were practical, relating to the temporary policy of the country in its foreign and domestic relations. Those issues have drifted away on the currents of progress, or been passed in the onward march of our common country. Measures that divided the opinions of our people, have become so established, that no sensible man questions their wisdom; or so buried in the dead past, that no sane man would hope to revive them. Time, the great living test of national policy, has settled, by its resistless demonstrations, the questions which agitated the country, and arrayed political organizations against each other in times past. They have had their day, and have passed into history. Sir, I said this

irrepressible conflict was eternal as right and wrong; and while all other issues have been passing away, this conflict has been gathering strength and power. True, sir, we have sought to avoid it. We have put it away on the right hand, and shoved it aside on the left; we have pushed it away from before us, and thrust it back behind us. But it would not be put off. The spirit of slavery is restless as it is wrong. It will not leave us alone; it will not be let alone. It troubled our fathers when this great union was formed. It troubled the sages and patriots who framed the federal constitution. It troubled the statesmen who guided this country in its infancy; and they saw with prophetic vision the mightier troubles which it would occasion in the years to come. It was present when Louisiana was purchased. It reared its head higher, and spoke with a voice more potential in 1820, when Missouri was added to the Union. It stood in still loftier and more compact stature, when Texas was annexed, and in 1850 when it demanded to be nationalized. It was matured in strength, in 1854, when it demanded of a Democratic administration and a subservient Democratic Congress, that every barrier standing in the way of its progress towards supremacy, should be swept away. It stands now, sir, in all its giant proportions, confident in its power, arrogant, overbearing, turbulent, reckless of violence, and careless of results; demanding the first and prominent place in the politics and policy of the country. It has crowded every other issue out of the political arena, and stands there at last, alone, armed and panopled for battle, determined on expansion, and defiant of opposition. I repeat, sir, the irrepressible conflict is upon us; but it is without our fault. It has been forced upon us, and we must sit down in craven silence, or fight it out to the bitter end.

Sir, do you comprehend the length and breadth of this conflict, the stupendous issues dependent upon its results? Did the Senator from the first, when he swung over to the side of slavery, and in his youthful zeal charged upon the freedom-loving men of the North—upon you and me, sir, upon every man around this circle; upon every man of his State who takes sides with freedom in the controversy thus forced upon us—the crime of treason against the Constitution and the Union; did he comprehend the nature of this conflict? Did he appreciate the character of the charges he so recklessly made, or the nature of the associations into which he so madly plunged? Sir, I will not speak of slavery in a humanitarian sense, I will not discuss its moral or religious bearing upon those who exercise or those who are subjected to its sway. To do so would be, in this age of light and truth, to insult your understanding. But I do propose to speak of it with reference to its political influences upon the prosperity and true glory of this great country, upon the honor and the perpetuity of our free institutions, and the integrity of the Union, with reference to the civil and social rights of the free white men of this nation. It is right that we should do so. It is necessary that all may comprehend the nature and inevitable tendencies of an institution that claims precedence over freedom and free institutions.

Sir, who will contradict me when I say, that the system of slavery is at war with every principle of republican freedom—with the whole theory and structure of our institutions—that it is a living reproach to our country, falsifying all our professions of regard for human rights. We boast to the world of our love of freedom. We are pointed to our three millions of men, created in the image of God, whom we have robbed of their humanity, and whom we buy and sell as chattels in the market. Shall we sink still deeper in the world's estimation by consenting to the spread of an institution which belies every profession of our love of liberty; which is a perpetual libel upon our theory of government, and a living refutation of the great truths embodied in our Declaration of Independence?

But, sir, consider the effect of this institution upon the physical prosperity of a nation. Virginia, at the close of the revolutionary war, was the leading State of the Union. She was first in population, and richest in resources. Her climate was the most salubrious, and her soil the most productive of all the States. She had harbors second to none on the Atlantic coasts; the best water power to propel machinery. Her mountains are full of coal, and her hills of iron. Her rivers broad and navigable, or easily made so. With all these advantages, where is Virginia now? States that were then but a wilderness, on almost every acre of which the old forests stood in all their prestine grandeur and primeval gloom, are away beyond her in population, in wealth, in enterprise, in everything that makes up the material prosperity of a nation. From being the first she has glided down to the fifth or sixth position in the scale of States, and every decade she takes a downward step. Her soil, sir, is becoming exhausted, her people enervated, lacking in energy, in enterprise, in the power of progress in a comparative sense, a blight spreading wider and wider, barrenness creeping further and further across her once generous and productive soil, and desolation being written in legible characters over district after district of her once fruitful bosom; and why is all this? Sir, study the philosophy of Slavery and you will understand it. "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treads out the corn," is a command as binding in its typical sense as is that which declares "thou shalt not steal," and the penalty affixed is the increasing barrenness of the soil where that command is violated.

Again, sir, look over the map of Virginia, and trace out her canals and her railroads. Measure them in distance, and calculate their cost. Where are her factories, where her workshops? Does the smoke of her furnaces go columning up to the sky? Where a stream comes down from the mountain, or a river leaps over a precipice, does the clank of machinery mingle with their roar? Has she laid her hand upon the running waters, and made them utilitarian, compelled them to grind corn, to throw the shuttle and spin? Sir, the little State of Vermont, whose narrow territory is cloven by that range of mountains that stand up in everlasting barrenness, but eternal verdure to the sky, has more miles and a larger amount in cost of public improvements than the great State of Virginia. You will scarcely find a factory or a workshop, worthy of the name, in all Virginia. You will find the mountain stream unchained, the plunging river free, with all their motive power un-

employed. You will see no smoke of furnaces, no blazing forges. And why? Virginia was a great State, the greatest in this great confederacy of States, the mother of heroes, of statesmen, of Presidents, and why is she thus laggard in the race of progress. Sir, study the philosophy of slavery and you will understand it. What is thus true of Virginia is true of every State where slavery is a cherished institution. It is the trail of the serpent over them all. Its improvidence impoverishes the soil. Its inertia hangs like an incubus upon enterprise. Its enforced and unpaid labor breaks down the energies of the masses. It is in violation of a great fundamental law that prosperity can, sir, attach only to a people where compensation follows physical exertion and the hope of reward stimulates toil.

Sir, the line between the Free and the Slave States is as traceable in the difference in the thrift of the people, and the value of their lands, as it is by the monuments erected to divide them. Kentucky is a Slave State as prosperous as any, but her lands, equally productive with those of Ohio, are not more than half equal in value to those of the latter to-day. Missouri has a soil rich as that of Illinois, but the value of the land of the latter is, on the average, more than twice that of the former. And why? Study the philosophy of Slavery, and you will understand it.

Again, sir, Virginia has a broad seacoast, and as safe harbors as there are in the world. Where, sir, is the ocean commerce of Virginia? where her Ships, her Steamers? She has none, sir. The little State of Rhode Island, having but a single Representative in the lower House of Congress, has her Ships, her Steamers, and her external commerce is greater than that of Virginia. And why? Study the philosophy of Slavery and you will understand it.

Study, now sir, the educational statistics of Virginia. I speak of her, sir, because she claims to be the leading and most enlightened Slave State in the Union. The little State of Connecticut, little only in natural resources and in population, in a comparative sense, has an Education Fund nearly double that of the great State of Virginia. Of the white population of Virginia, one in ten can neither read nor write. Of those in Connecticut the ratio is as one to seventy-four, including even the foreign population within her borders. Connecticut sends out her school teachers over all the Union, and her Missionaries over all the world—her Academies and Colleges are famed throughout this whole Confederacy—her scholars adorn the Science, and her writers the Literature of the world—every child reared within her Territory has the means of acquiring a substantial English education, free of expense. Is it so in Virginia? Let every tenth man and woman in that State, who can neither read nor write, answer. What is thus true of Connecticut is true of almost every Free State; and what is thus true of Virginia is less than the truth of almost every other Slave State. In South Carolina, and that outside of the vice and degradation of the cities, is a rural white population of over 30,000, one-ninth of the whole population, so besotted and degraded, so demoralized and imbruited as to be the scorn of the slaves of the plantations in the neighborhood of which they are scattered. These, sir, are the descendants of those whom, a hundred years ago, before the full blight and curse of Slavery had been developed, were small farmers, prosperous and intelligent in their way, but whose posterity has thus hopelessly degenerated under the demoralizing influences of Slavery. Do you ask, sir, why this should be so? Study the philosophy of Slavery, and you will be answered.

I have thus far spoken of the effects of slavery upon the material prosperity of the States in which it exists, and if I am asked, "What is that to us?" I answer, in all frankness, nothing. If I am asked again, "If those States choose to foster and uphold an institution which thus obstructs their progress, what is that to us?" I answer again, in all frankness, nothing. If Virginia chooses to cling to the disease that is wasting her, she has the right to do so. It is her business, and not ours, and you or I have no right to interfere

But when the question arises, as it has arisen, and is presented to us now, whether this demoralizing institution shall be an outspreading and progressive one, whether it shall be permitted to march forward into territory now free, carrying with it this blight of death into territory in which you and I, and our posterity, have an interest, under the sanction of national favor and the protection of Federal law, then, sir, I answer, that we have much, everything, to do with it. When it is proposed to make the interests and the spread of slavery, and the protection of slave labor and slave property the great leading feature of our national policy, it comes home to us then, affects our honor and our rights, is within the sphere of our duties, and posterity will hold us responsible for our action.

But, sir, there are other aspects in which this institution should be regarded. I speak of it still in a political sense, and of its bearing upon the material prosperity and social rights of the people of this country. Sir, the slave spirit is opposed to social order, turbulent, aggressive, regardless of legal and constitutional restraints. Founded upon the baldest violation of human rights, and sustained only by the law of the strongest, its imperial elements scoff at the restraints of governmental institutions. The Federal Constitution guarantees freedom of opinion and of the press. Within the last four years, a citizen of Virginia, occupying a respectable position, of untarnished character and undoubted loyalty to the Union, was hunted from his family and the State, because he attended as a delegate to the Republican Convention that nominated John C. Fremont, and every paper in Virginia under the influence of the slave power justified the outrage.

In Kentucky, the destruction of a free press and the cold blooded murder of its editor, are among the unavenged outrages of the lawless spirit of slavery.

Sir, in what State south of Mason and Dixon's line would your life or mine be safe, if the facts of our being members of the Republican Party, and held to the Republican faith, were known? In which Southern State would the life of the Senator from the first be worth an hour's purchase, if he exercised the right of saying what has become organic in his heart, that slavery is wrong, and wicked in principle, and hurtful to the prosperity of a country in practice? Sir, accounts come to us every day, of insult and

outrage to which free men of the North are subjected while traveling in the Southern States, for saying, or even thinking, greatly less than this in favor of freedom.

Sir, the Constitution guarantees freedom of debate in Congress, that the persons of members shall be sacred from outrage, that they shall not be called to account for words spoken or language used in official discussion.

A member of Congress, sir, stalked into the Senate chamber and clubbed down a Senator in his place, for speaking in defence of freedom and against the spread of slavery, in language becoming a free man of the free North. Let no man suppose that the outrage of Brooks upon Senator Sumner was the sequence of a personal quarrel, that the felon blow was the result of personal hostility, incited by personal insult. It was the mad and lawless spirit of slavery, rioting in its normal violence, trampling upon human rights, scoffing at Constitutions, and stamping with its iron heel upon organic law. It was the absolutism of the slave spirit crushing freedom of opinion and of speech and debate by the strong arm of physical force. It was the cruel tyranny of the slave spirit, that would strike down human liberty everywhere, and stifle the voice of freedom, even in blood.

Sir, every press in the slave States justified this monstrous outrage. The Democracy of the South eulogised the perpetrator of it, and the Democracy of the north stood in craven silence with no word of condemnation. The slave spirit possessed the Southern Democracy, who applauded the outrage, and it cowed the Northern Democracy, who dared not disavow or condemn it.

But all these outrages, great as they are, furnish no comparison with the gigantic villainy perpetrated by the Slave Power in the Territory of Kansas. That villainy is matter of history now; and I speak of it only as an illustration of the true genius and spirit of Slavery rioting in unrestraint, spreading itself in all its monstrous proportions when unawed by the presence of a controlling power. That Territory, sir, was consecrated to freedom by a compact as solemn as language and circumstances could make it—a compact possessing all the moral if not legal force of organic law. The Slave Power demanded the abrogation of that compact; and that demand, through the solidarity of the Slave Democracy of the South, aided by a craven acquiescence on the part of the Democracy of the North, was conceded. The Slave Power, having broken down this last barrier against its onward march, strode forward to take possession. It was met by the peaceful current of a free population. It armed itself with weapons of war. It organized armed forces, and invaded that peaceful Territory with hosts of ruffians who marked with desolation, with the corpses of murdered citizens and the smouldering ruins of burned homes, the path that they followed. Rapine and plunder went hand in hand with them. They took possession of the ballot-boxes, and voted themselves into office. They made legislators of themselves, and passed laws exceeding in atrocity even those of the Athenian tyrant. They burned cities and sacked towns. They robbed and murdered without mercy and without remorse, and the Slave Power in Congress and out of it justified their enormities. The Slave spirit, sir, possessed itself of a venal and corrupt Administration, and the cry of the oppressed met with no response from Washington. Worse than that, sir, the Administration claimed to be Democratic. The great bulk of Democracy had come to be aggregated in the Slave States; and at the bidding of the Slave Power, the might of the Administration was exerted in behalf of the oppressor, and justified and upheld the gigantic outrage and wrong. Sir, I said these things have passed into history, and I thank God that it is so. The record has been made up and sealed, and can no longer be falsified. Though that great struggle for freedom in Kansas belongs now to the past, yet, sir, the mad raid of John Brown, that sent an ague chill of terror thrilling through all the South, was but the faint and dying echo of the mightier outrages perpetrated by slavery on the people of Kansas. It was the insane vengeance of a man who had brooded over the stupendous wrongs he had suffered till madness took possession of his brain, and he regarded himself as the champion chosen of God to exterminate slavery.

Let us pause for one moment to inquire into the nature and extent of this "invasion" of Virginia, as it is termed. It is proper that we should do so, for it is one of the sins charged against the Republican party by the Senator from the first. Sir, there are three hundred thousand voting Republicans in New York—there are half a million in Ohio and Pennsylvania—there are hundreds of thousands in New England. Think you, sir, that if these million in these States had conspired to invade and revolutionize Virginia, to conquer her chivalry and capture her slaves, that an enterprise of such magnitude would have been entrusted to an army of seventeen white men and five negroes? But, sir, John Brown and his twenty-one followers attacked and overcome a town, containing, it is said, some three thousand Virginians. They took it without the loss of a man—without spilling one drop of blood on either side. "Invasion from the North!" startled the sleepers from their dreams. "Invasion from the North!" flashed along the telegraph wires and thundered along the railways. Terror seized the heart of the Chivalry, and dismay sat in distortion on the face of all the South. There was spurring in hot haste.

> "There was mounting 'mong Graemes of the Netherby Clan,
> The Musgraves, the Sitgrieves, they rode and they ran,
> There was racing and chasing o'er Canby Lee."

The hair on the venerable head of the President stood out like quills upon the fretful porcupine, as the cry "Invasion from the North" went echoing along the Halls of the Executive Mansion. The heart of Governor Wise died within him as the cry of "Invasion from the North" swept like the cry of the Vulture over Virginia. Think, sir, of the extremity of that terror which could reduce the Governor's letters from six solid columns in the Richmond Inquirer to telegrams of less than three lines in length! And, sir, what was this "Invasion from the North!" that shook the whole South with an ague chill of dismay and fear? What numbered this army which was to upheave the civic and social institutions of Virginia, and lead her Chivalry away captive? Seventeen white men and five negroes!

But, sir, the cry of "Invasion from the North" went ringing like the trumpet call of the

Avenging Angel through the South. The President ordered down to Harper's Ferry an army of Federal Marines from Washington; and Governor Wise ordered up an army of State troops from Norfolk and another from Richmond. And Maryland sent up another army from Baltimore. Banners flaunted in the breeze—bayonets glistened and sharp swords flashed in the sunlight—the tramp, tramp of armed hosts was along all the highways. All these military divisions were converging upon a common centre, and that centre was the ill-fated Harper's Ferry. That doomed town was surrounded by a cordon of Southern Chivalry, waiting only the word to rush together in the courage of its great heart to the slaughter and carnage of battle.

Do you remember, sir, that "Charge of the Light Brigade" at Balaklava, upon the Russian Batteries—that charge, sir, which gave immortality to the "six hundred" of the bravest men whom the world ever looked upon, while it consigned five hundred and thirty of them to a bloody grave—that charge which should blast the name of the man who ordered it with eternal infamy? Sir, do you remember Tennison's beautiful lines?

"Half a league, half a league, half a league onward!
Into the valley of death rode the six hundred.
'Forward the Light Brigade;' 'charge for the guns!' he said—
Into the valley of death rode the six hundred!"

Do you remember, sir, what followed?

"Cannon to right of them!
Cannon to left of them!
Cannon in front of them
Volleyed and thundered!
Stormed at by shot and shell,
Boldly they rode, and well,
Into the jaws of death!
Into the mouth of Hell
Rode the six hundred!"

What was the courage of the "Light Brigade," the glorious "six hundred," compared with the immortal daring of the President's Marines and Virginia's Chivalry that surrounded the fated town of Harper's Ferry? The word was given:

"Charge, Chester, charge! On, Stanley, on!"

And this cordon of death closed like the rush of mighty waters. The armed hosts rushed together like the collapse of mountains, till their very bayonets crossed. And what, think you, sir, they had inclosed in that fated circle? Seventeen white men and five negroes—dead, wounded and missing! Not a white man more, not one negro less! Sir, was there ever before enacted, in the face of an intelligent people, such a stupendous farce!

Sir, I do not stand here to justify, but to denounce this insane raid of John Brown, upon Harper's Ferry. But, sir, I do not stand here to spit upon his grave, nor to heap infamy upon his name. God looks upon the heart in rendering his retribution of good or evil. He whom Gov. Wise, even in the midst of his paroxysm of revenge and terror, pronounced the bravest and most truthful man he ever saw, could not have been organically a bad man. John Brown, sir, sleeps in the grave, into which the hunt of vengeance, and not the calm, firm course of justice consigned him. He has gone to a tribunal before which his accusers must meet him face to face; where human pride, power, influence might have no voice, and where justice to the oppressed and the oppressor, the strong and the weak, the spoiler and the spoiled, is measured out by the standard of immaculate and eternal truth.

"No further seek his merits to disclose,
Nor drag his frailties from their dread abode,
Where they alike in tender hope repose,
The bosom of his father and his God."

Sir, I have shown you what this spirit of Slavery is. I have shown you the organic elements of the Slave Power, everywhere and always. I have shown you its influence upon the material prosperity of the States wherein it exists—its influence over the social institutions and internal progress of a people—its influence upon the great cause of Human Liberty, and its bearing upon the Rights of Man. I repeat, sir, once more: the "irrepressible conflict" between Freedom and Slavery has been forced upon us. The great questions of the present and the proximate future—and, mystify it as we may, deny it as we may, the only questions—are, Shall Slavery be nationalized? Shall it be an outspreading and progressive institution, marching forward, always under the protection of Federal law and shielded by the Stars and Stripes? Is there to be no limit to its expansion? Shall all the broad territory of the Great West—territory large enough to make ten New Englands—territory reserved by the patriotism, the wisdom, the humanity of our fathers as an inheritance to the generations of freemen to come after them, consecrating it to free labor, free enterprise, and free institutions—be given over, through all time, to the blight and curse of Slavery? Shall the virgin richness of its soil be exhausted, its resources wasted, by the reckless culture of the bondman's toil? Shall free thought, free speech, free discussion, free enterprise, and a free press be banished from it forever? Shall this mad spirit of Slavery, that riots in misrule, that upheaves organic law and tramples upon the constitutional rights of freemen, go on spreading and expanding until there shall be no limit to its power? Shall the policy of this Government be shaped by Slavery, and controlled to the advancement of its interests and the expansion of its area? Sir, and Senators, what is your response to these pregnant questions? You must answer them, not by bravado, not by your silence, but by the expressive and practical language of conduct and action. Let no man deceive himself. The momentous issue between Freedom and Slavery must be settled now. Every other issue has been thrust out of the political arena, and this alone remains. Human ingenuity can no longer shirk it—human wisdom cannot postpone it. We have reached at last the parting of the ways, and must move on. There is no neutral ground—no middle path; and we cannot stand still. The pressure from behind impels us onward. We are accomplishing a work of destiny, and no human power can absolve us from the responsibility of action. All that is left us is to choose which course we will follow. On the one hand is the cause of freedom, free thought, free speech, free labor, free enterprise, a free press free territory, and free institutions; and, on the other, slavery, with all its sequences of evil. Sir, and Senators, which path will you follow?

This issue, sir, has been forcing itself upon the country ever since the foundation of the government. The slave power has been steadily pushing its way forward during all that period, and every step it has taken has been aggressive. It

rose up and blustered, threatened dissolution and demanded compromise. The North, in its love of peace and veneration for the Union, has always yielded, under the condition that each successive concession should be regarded as a finality—but scarcely has the ink become dry on the page upon which such concession has been written, when some new demand has been made, enforced in a spirit of haughty arrogance, and conceded by way of compromise by the North in its love of quiet.

The ordinance of 1787 was a compromise. The Constitution itself was a compromise. The law of 1820, admitting Missouri, was a compromise. The conditions on which Texas was admitted were a compromise. The laws of 1850, including the fugitive slave law, were a compromise. And each of these compromises was to be regarded as a finality. The Democracy, North and South, over and over again declared them such. The then living but now dead Whig Party declared them such. Even the American Party, while it was strutting its little hour upon the stage, declared them such. And yet all these solemn compacts, all these compromises, were ropes of sand in view of the slave power, to be broken, trampled upon, scattered to the winds, whenever its interests or its caprice demanded some new concession.

The South by its solidarity, by making its peculiar institution the bond of its union, has annihilated or degraded every political party North and South. It annihilated the old Federal Party. It has, by its bids for support, utterly demoralized the Democratic Party, making it the instrument of slavery propagandism, and nothing else. All its old landmarks have been removed. Its lofty principles and ennobling policy, initiated by Jefferson and carried forward by his immediate successors abandoned, and the name is all that is left of that once glorious and patriotic organization.

The Whig Party, sir, was a noble and a patriotic party, reckoning among its supporters names deathless as history. Enticed into the service of slavery, it passed into dilapidation and decay. It "went down like some bright exhalation of the evening," and all that is left of it are a few solitary petrifactions, the fossil remains of a vanished era.

The American Party, sir, was a noble and a patriotic party, growing up out of the chaos of the times, it had about it all the elements of strength and durability. It appealed to the pride of nationality, to the home instincts and sympathies of the American heart. In an evil hour it leagued itself with slavery, and is already reckoned among the things that have been, as belonging to history. All that is left of it are a few sad and solitary ghosts, wandering on this side of the political Styx, with too little merit to be ferried across for nothing, and too poor to pay old Charon his penny for carrying them over. It glanced like a meteor across the political heavens, wherein it might have been fixed as a star. It vanished like a meteor into the darkness and was lost in the black shadow of slavery.

And thus, sir, it has been. The spirit of slavery has destroyed the integrity and the power of every party in the Union. It utterly annihilated the old Federal Party—it broke the back of the Democracy—it paralyzed and destroyed the Whig Party—and it knocked the brains out of the American Party. It has been the bane of every political organization since the foundation of the government, and it will continue to be such until it shall have been met face to face, and been struck one straightforward trenchant blow by the clenched fist and the strong arm of the North.

Sir, they call us who resist the encroachments of slavery, who would not surrender the control of this government into the hands, or permit its policy to be shaped by the slave power, who would save the broad territories of the mighty West from the blight and curse of slavery, sectional. And why? Because we have taken our position on the side of freedom, and appealing to the traditions and axioms of the fathers, call upon the free men of the free States to sustain us in bringing the policy of the Union back to its ancient moorings. And who is responsible for this? Who has driven us to this position? The South demands an administration that will sustain by its influence and power the spread of slavery, that will throw open the territories to its advancement, and place federal arms in the hands of federal troops to enforce its propagandism. We have appealed to the South against the injustice of its course. We appealed to its sense of justice, to its appreciation of honor against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and how have we been answered? Let the outrages in the Senate Chamber, the rapine and plunder in Kansas, the burning of towns and the murder of citizens committed in that doomed Territory, justified by every Southern Senator and every Southern press; the insult and outrage heaped upon citizens of free States while traveling in the South for lisping one word in favor of freedom, the violation of private correspondence and official robbery of the mails, speak the nature of that response. What then was left to us but an appeal to the great heart of the fifteen millions of free people of the North? But we did not, and we do not appeal to the North alone. We appeal to all men, to patriots who love their country, to statesmen who would advance its true interests and highest glory, to lovers of liberty everywhere, in all the States, and if our appeal is responded to only by the free men of the North, who is responsible for that?

But, sir, is it true that the only test of nationality is to favor the extension of human slavery? Is the spread of that institution, with all its sequences of evil become the great leading feature of our national policy? Are we bound by our national obligations to be the propagandists of a system which the whole world has denounced, which is at war with every principle of human rights, which in every attribute is the antipode of republican freedom, against all the teachings of Christian civilization and all the axioms of an enlightened philanthropy? Sir, this is the logical sequence, if to oppose the extension of Slavery is sectional and not national. Sir, this charge of sectionalism in the mouths of our opponents is an insult to the intelligence of the age. It is more. It is a hypocritical and canting subterfuge. It is the cry of the fugitive, of stop thief, while he runs away with his plunder. Sir, this device has come to be understood. The people have studied into the matter, and at last have comprehended the great fact, that until the whole philosophy of our system of govern-

ment, the whole theory and superstructure of our institutions shall be changed, until right and wrong shall change places in the vocabulary of the world, freedom can never be sectional. Its principles are universal, and should prevail wherever human government or human fate prevails. Sir, tell me when the Southern States, on any question involving however remotely the interests of Slavery, have failed to stand together, making their peculiar institutions a bond of political union? An instance of their being divided on such an issue has not yet been recorded in history. And it is their solidarity that gives gives them power. What is the spectacle that has been presented during the last two months at Washington? The Southern States standing together, an iron phalanx, resisting as one man, in factious opposition, the organization of the House, and they stood thus for more than eight weeks, and why? Because the representatives of the 15,000,000 of the North will not bow down and worship at the shrine of Slavery. Sir, there is but one sentiment pervading all the South, a sentiment intensely sectional, beginning and ending at the South—that holds the South in unity, and precipitates the Southern States in a body into the political arena, and that sentiment is the extension of Slavery. Who then are the sectionalists, and who is responsible, if the North, following the example thus set, and impelled by necessities growing out of inevitable and everlasting antagonisms shall stand together for freedom, making the extension of free institutions, the promotion of the interests of free enterprise and free labor the bond of their union?

Sir, there are inequalities enough, evils enough existing already under the Constitution, without extending them by enlarging the area of slavery. You will see, sir, by looking over the map of this country, that the territory now organized into States, contains in round numbers 1,400,000 square miles, and of this slavery has possession of 800,000, and freedom of 600,000. These 800,000 square miles are peopled by about 7,000,000 of free white men; and the 600,000 are peopled by about 15,000,000 of free white men. Sir, there is something due to the posterity of these 15,000,000 of free, white, working men of this country. The 7,000,000 of the south have possession of one-third more territory than the 15,000,000 of the north; and is there a lack of nationality in insisting, that these 15,000,000 will not rob their posterity of land, and labor, and freedom, and republican equality, that slavery may be extended?

The 15,000,000 of the north are represented in Congress by 176 representatives. The 7,000,000 by 120. Equality of representation would give the free North more than double the representatives of the South, whereas we now lack sixty-four of that number. And why? Because, by the compromises made when the Constitution was framed, it was agreed, that one free, white man, who owned five slaves at the South, should equal in representation four free men of the North, who owned none. Such are the inequalities already existing under the Constitution, and while I denounce them as a fraud and an outrage upon the North, yet they are in the Constitution, and I am content that they should remain there.

But, sir, it is not the 7,000,000 of the slave states who are clamoring for an extension of slavery. *They* have not corrupted the administration; they have not degraded and subornèd the democracy. They have not prostituted and destroyed Americanism. They did not annihilate the Whig Party. This, sir, was the work of the 350,000 slaveholders. The *people* of the South are not responsible for the outrages perpetrated in Washington; the outrages upon Northern citizens in the Southern States, or the still more gigantic outrages perpetrated in Kansas. These again, sir, are the work of the 350,000 slaveholders of the south, who subsist upon the fruits of the bondmen's toil. They have sons for the army and navy, for clerks in the public offices, for marshals, for the customs, and the petty offices of the government. They can fill foreign missions and consulates and home departments, the secretaryships and the judgeships; and it is the possession of these that stimulates their nationality. They are not geographically sectional. They will vote for a Northern man, provided his face is plastic, and his principles are Southern, and provided he will give the South—and that means them—a monopoly of official spoils. These 350,000 slaveholders control the politics of the South, and they market their influence wherever it will bring the highest price.

And now, sir, I repeat once more, that we are in the midst of this irrepressible conflict between Freedom and Slavery, and that the South stands as a solid phalanx in favor of Slavery—that we of the North must take position—we cannot remain neutral—the ways part here, and we must take the right hand or the left. Sir, we are told that this Union will be dissolved if a Republican President shall, in accordance with the Constitutional forms, be elected in 1860. This announcement has been made in high quarters. Southern Democrats have made it in the Federal Senate, and Northern Democrats utter no word of dissent or rebuke. Southern Democrats make it every day in the House of Representatives, and Northern Democracy echoes the traitorous threat. Sir, shall we give up our organization? shall we dissolve our party? shall we bow our heads in humility, and in accents of submission, cry "*peccavi! culpa mea! culpa mea! peccavi!*" or shall we stand up, in the courage and patriotism of our manhood, and meet these traitors and conspirators against the Union with a calm and stern defiance?

But, sir, this threat of dissolution is an idle tale with which to frighten children. If it shall intimidate the 15,000,000 of the Free North now, then are they irreclaimable cowards, and deserve all the outrage heaped upon them. Sir, if danger there be to the Union, it is not in the election of a Republican President, but in his defeat—not, sir, in the unity of the North, but in its divisions—not in the triumph of Freedom, but in the triumph of Slavery. Sir, look back over the past and see how this controversy has been growing for decades—how contention on this Slavery issue has been rising higher and higher, and discussion waxing fiercer and fiercer every year. The 15,000,000 of the north are aroused to the assertion of their rights. They have forborne the exercise of the power vested by the Constitution in the might of majorities, till their forbearance has reached the boundary of virtue. They are content that Slavery shall remain in safety where it now is—they are content that it shall repose in security

and are ready to protect it within the States—but they have resolved that it shall go no further. This controversy can be settled now, but the Territories and future States must be free. They have seen the Missouri Compromise swept away, but they have resolved that Slavery shall gain nothing by that outrage. Stay its progress now, go back to the spirit of ancient compacts—let it be settled now and forever that Slavery shall never travel beyond the line of 36.30—that there shall be no more acquisition of Slave Territory, whether by conquest or purchase, and contention will cease, agitation will be hushed, excitement will die away and fraternal feeling will take the place of sectional hates. The South will acquiesce because such a settlement will be just, and the north will be content because it was "so nominated in the bond."

But, sir, let the solidarity of the South, aided by a truckling and craven spirit at the North, give to Slavery a triumph now; let it go out that the policy of this Government, its great object and mission, is to foster and extend slavery; that that institution is to be nationalized; and this excitement on the subject of slavery will become a consuming fire. The fifteen millions of the free North will throw away the scabbard from the sword they have drawn, and its keen edge will be applied with a relentless purpose. They are not abolitionists now; but the conservative spirit that holds them in check has a limit to its forbearance. Their war with slavery is one of self-defence; but if slavery shall triumph now, it will become one of aggression, and you and I, no earthly power, can prevent it. We are drifting, sir, upon the current of a destiny, under a higher direction than mere human agencies; and deprecate it as we may, struggle as we may, tremble as we may in view of the rapids towards which we may seem to be drifting, we are borne onwards by its resistless sweep.

You will remember that this conflict is not between opposing factions. It is not a strife of personal ambition. It is not a war of the Pigmies. It is a war of the Giants. It is a conflict of principle, involving the great interests of humanity; between progress and retrogression; between right and wrong; and in such a conflict, when fairly begun, the weaker will go to the wall. Give to Slavery a triumph now, and these fifteen millions of freemen will exert the constitutional power vested in the might of majorities, and no human power can prevent them. They will attack Slavery in its strongholds. They will attack it in the District of Columbia, and sweep it away. They will attack the slave trade between the States, and its annihilation will follow. They will repeal the Fugitive Slave Law. They will drive Slavery from the Federal Courts by the enactment of a Federal law that man can hold no property in man. They will attack the Constitution itself, not by disregarding its sanctions, but by demanding its amendment, so as to destroy the inequality of representation and making the President elective by the whole people and by a direct vote. Such, sir, is the Phœnix that I see rising out of the ashes of the Republican Party—such the warfare that I see looming up beyond its defeat; and when that warfare shall have begun, then, sir, the Union will indeed be in danger, and its dissolution may be counted upon as among the eventualities of a proximate future.

The danger, then, I repeat, is in the defeat and not in the success of the principles which underlie the Republican Party. That party, sir, is the only truly conservative party, the only party under whose control this Union is or can be safe. It stands between Southern extremists, the pro-slavery fanaticism, the mad secessionists of the south, and the wild and frenzied abolitionism, the anti-slavery fanaticism of the North. It grasps these world-wide but destructive antagonisms in either hand, and restrains their frantic rage. Does not its success, therefore, appeal to the patriotism, the love for the Union, of every American heart?

But, sir, if the election of a Republican President, achieved through constitutional means, will dissolve this Union—if the vindication of free speech, free enterprise, free labor, free territory, and free institutions, will break the bands that hold these States together—then, sir, the Union, this Confederation, the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and all our boasted institutions, are a gigantic fraud, a stupendous cheat, and a lie.

Sir, I have no fears that the election of a Republican President will dissolve the Union. If I thought it would——sir, shall I go on? I may speak treason if I do. Sir, I love this Union. It is a glorious compact, full of destiny to the generations who are to come after us. Its integrity, its perpetuity, is of momentous import to the far off future of the whole world. It involves everything conducive to the advancement of human freedom, everything auxiliary to human progress, everything of interest to the great cause of Christian civilization. If it were to perish now, the idea of self-government, of Republican freedom might well become obsolete. If our great experiment should fail, the hope of freedom for the oppressed of other lands might well be surrendered in despair.

But, sir, much as I love and venerate the Union, vast as are the interests that cluster around its perpetuity, and mighty as would be the sequence of its dissolution—yet, sir, rather than see slavery nationalized—rather than see it march forward into territory consecrated to freedom—rather than see it break away from the State sovereignties and become an outspreading and progressive institution, protected and fostered by the Federal power—rather than that the extension of its area and the protection of its interests should become the leading feature of our national policy—I say, sir, let this Union be dissolved. Let slavery take its portion, and be separate. Let the Southern States hug to their bosoms their cherished institution, until they perish in the folds of the serpent they have nourished. But let the free North be sinless. Let them stand apart from the gigantic wrong, the Heaven daring wickedness of slavery, and escape the curse of God, written all over history, denouncing retribution and woe against the nations that rob the defenceless or oppress the poor.

Sir, this Union cannot be dissolved. Let no man suppose that dissolution can be accomplished, short of the carnage, and chaos of revolution, and beyond which are the blasting horrors of a servile war. Sir, the great conservative States of the North, will never consent to disunion. Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania, will never consent to it. New England will

never consent to it. The young, loyal States of the West, will never consent to it. These States, sir, will save the Union from dissolution, They will save the South from itself—the slave States from their own madness and folly. They will not leave the South to the horrors of a war of the races, that will surely follow the breaking down of this Confederation. I repeat, sir, this Union cannot be dissolved. New York is a great State—the greatest in this Confederation of States; greatest in population; greatest in commerce; greatest in wealth; greatest in resources, and second to none in the patriotism of her people. New York is a loyal State, loyal to the Constitution, loyal to the Union, and the fundamental principles which lie at the foundations of our republican institutions. She is a conservative State—not that conservatism which nestles among bales of cotton, or burrows in hogsheads of sugar. It is not the conservatism of cowardice that trembles at the frown, or yields to the menaces of madmen North or South. Hers is the conservatism of principle, the conservatism of justice and right; the conservatism that is true to itself, that will neither do nor suffer wrong. New York, sir, knows her strength. She can afford to be magnanimous. She is content to be forbearing; but she will bide her time. While peace reigns, she will keep bright the chain that encircles the Union. She will brush away with a gentle hand, the clouds of prejudice. She will whisper down the voice of contention. Where strife is, she will interpose conciliation, and like an elder sister, watchful of the honor of those weaker and younger than herself, she will lead these States onward to a brighter glory, and more enduring renown. But, sir, in the hour of danger, whether from foes without or TRAITORS within, when the tempest shall come, and the institutions of our country shall rock and reel upon their deep foundations, then will New York, by the giant power of her strength, hold this Union firm upon its basis, and safe, amid the earthquake and the storm.

THE

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

Resolved, That we, the delegated representatives of the Republican electors of the United States, in Convention assembled, in discharge of the duty we owe to our constituents and our country, unite in the following declarations:

1. That the history of the nation during the last four years has fully established the propriety and necessity of the organization and perpetuation of the Republican party, and that the causes which called it into existence are permanent in their nature, and now, more than ever before, demand its peaceful and constitutional triumph.

2. That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution—"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed"—is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions; and that the Federal Constitution, the Rights of the States, and the Union of the States, must and shall be preserved.

3. That to the Union of the States this nation owes its unprecedented increase in population, its surprising development of material resources, its rapid augmentation of wealth, its happiness at home and its honor abroad, and we hold in abhorrence all schemes for Disunion, come from whatever source they may: and we congratulate the country that no Republican Member of Congress has uttered or countenanced the threats of Disunion so often made by Democratic Members, without rebuke and with applause from their political associates; and we denounce those threats of Disunion, in case of a popular overthrow of their ascendancy, as denying the vital principles of a free government, and as an avowal of contemplated treason which it is the imperative duty of an indignant people sternly to rebuke and forever silence.

4. That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of powers on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

5. That the present Democratic Administration has far exceeded our worst apprehensions, in its measureless subserviency to the exactions of a sectional interest, as especially evinced in its desperate exertions to force the infamous Lecompton Constitution upon the protesting people of Kansas; in construing the personal relation between master and servant to involve an unqualified property in persons; in its attempted enforcement, everywhere, on land and sea, through the intervention of Congress and of the Federal Courts, of the extreme pretensions of a purely local interest; and in its general and unvarying abuse of the power entrusted to it by a confiding people.

6. That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal Government; that a return to rigid economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the systematic plunder of the public treasury by favored partisans; while the recent startling developments of frauds and corruptions at the Federal Metropolis, show that an entire change of administration is imperatively demanded.

7. That the new dogma that the Constitution, of its own force, carries slavery into any or all of the Territories of the United States, is a dangerous political heresy, at

variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself, with cotemporaneous exposition, and with legislative and judicial precedent; is revolutionary in its tendency, and subversive of the peace and harmony of the country.

8. That the normal condition of all the territory of the United States is that of freedom; that, as our republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that "no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law," it becomes our duty, by legislation, whenever such legislation is necessary, to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it; and we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States.

9. That we brand the recent reopening of the African slave-trade, under the cover of our national flag, aided by perversions of judicial power, as a crime against humanity and a burning shame to our country and age; and we call upon Congress to take prompt and efficient measures for the total and final suppression of that execrable traffic.

10. That in the recent vetoes, by their Federal Governors, of the acts of the Legislatures of Kansas and Nebraska prohibiting slavery in those Territories, we find a practical illustration of the boasted Democratic principle of Non-Intervention and Popular Sovereignty embodied in the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and a demonstration of the deception and fraud involved therein.

11. That Kansas should, of right, be immediately admitted as a State under the Constitution recently formed and adopted by her people, and accepted by the House of Representatives.

12. That, while providing revenue for the support of the general government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the working men liberal wages, to agriculture remunerating prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence.

13. That we protest against any sale or alienation to others of the public lands held by actual settlers, and against any view of the Free Homestead policy which regards the settlers as paupers or suppliants for public bounty; and we demand the passage by Congress of the complete and satisfactory Homestead measure which has already passed the House.

14. That the Republican party is opposed to any change in our Naturalization Laws or any State legislation by which the rights of citizenship hitherto accorded to immigrants from foreign lands shall be abridged or impaired; and in favor of giving a full and efficient protection to the rights of all classes of citizens, whether native or naturalized, both at home and abroad.

15. That appropriations by Congress for River and Harbor improvements of a national character, required for the accommodation and security of an existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution and justified by the obligation of Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

16. That a Railroad to the Pacific Ocean is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country; that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction; and that, as preliminary thereto, a daily Overland Mail should be promptly established.

17. Finally, having thus set forth our distinctive principles and views, we invite the co-operation of all citizens, however differing on other questions, who substantially agree with us in their affirmance and support.

SUPPLEMENTARY RESOLUTION.

Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with those men who have been driven, some from their native States and others from the States of their adoption, and are now exiled from their homes on account of their opinions; and we hold the Democratic party responsible for this gross violation of that clause of the Constitution which declares that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

ADOPTED AT CHICAGO, MAY 17, 1860.

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS.—No. 5.

National Politics.

SPEECH

OF

ABRAHAM LINCOLN,

OF ILLINOIS,

Delivered at the Cooper Institute, Monday, February 27, 1860.

Mr. President and Fellow-Citizens of New York: The facts with which I shall deal this evening are mainly old and familiar; nor is there anything new in the general use I shall make of them. If there shall be any novelty, it will be in the mode of presenting the facts, and the inferences and observations following that presentation.

In his speech last autumn, at Columbus, Ohio, as reported in "The New York Times," Senator Douglas said:

"Our fathers, when they framed the Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now."

I fully indorse this, and I adopt it as a text for this discourse. I so adopt it because it furnishes a precise and an agreed starting point for a discussion between Republicans and that wing of Democracy headed by Senator Douglas. It simply leaves the inquiry: "What was the understanding those fathers had of the question mentioned?"

What is the frame of Government under which we live?

The answer must be: "The Constitution of the United States." That Constitution consists of the original, framed in 1787 (and under which the present Government first went into operation), and twelve subsequently framed amendments, the first ten of which were framed in 1789.

Who were our fathers that framed the Constitution? I suppose the "thirty-nine" who signed the original instrument may be fairly called our fathers who framed that part of the present Government. It is almost exactly true to say they framed it, and it is altogether true to say they fairly represented the opinion and sentiment of the whole nation at the time. Their names being familiar to nearly all, and accessible to quite all, need not now be repeated.

I take these "thirty-nine," for the present, as being "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live."

What is the question which, according to the text, those fathers understood just as well, and even better than we do now?

It is this: Does the proper division of local from federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbid our Federal Government to control as to slavery in our Federal Territories?

Upon this, Douglas holds the affirmative, and Republicans the negative. This affirmative and denial form an issue; and this issue—the question—is precisely what the text declares our fathers understood better than we.

Let us now inquire whether the "thirty-nine," or any of them, ever acted upon this

☞For Sale at the Office of the Albany Evening Journal. Price, per Single Copy, 2c.; per Dozen Copies, 20c.; per Hundred, $1; per Thousand, $8.

question; and if they did, how they acted upon it—how they expressed that better understanding.

In 1784—three years before the Constitution—the United States then owning the Northwestern Territory, and no other—the Congress of the Confederation had before them the question of prohibiting slavery in that Territory; and four of the "thirty-nine" who afterward framed the Constitution were in that Congress, and voted on that question. Of these, Roger Sherman, Thomas Mifflin, and Hugh Williamson voted for the prohibition—thus showing that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in federal territory. The other of the four—James McHenry—voted against the prohibition, showing that, for some cause, he thought it improper to vote for it.

In 1787, still before the Constitution, but while the Convention was in session framing it, and while the Northwestern Territory still was the only territory owned by the United States—the same question of prohibiting slavery in the territory again came before the Congress of the Confederation; and three more of the "thirty-nine" who afterward signed the Constitution, were in that Congress, and voted on the question. They were William Blount, William Few and Abraham Baldwin; and they all voted for the prohibition—thus showing that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbids the Federal Government to control as to slavery in federal territory. This time the prohibition became a law, being part of what is now well known as the Ordinance of '87.

The question of federal control of slavery in the territories, seems not to have been directly before the Convention which framed the original Constitution; and hence it is not recorded that the "thirty-nine" or any of them, while engaged on that instrument, expressed any opinion on that precise question.

In 1789, by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution, an act was passed to enforce the Ordinance of '87, including the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory. The bill for this act was reported by one of the "thirty-nine," Thomas Fitzsimmons, then a member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania. It went through all its stages without a word of opposition, and finally passed both branches without yeas and nays, which is equivalent to an unanimous passage. In this Congress there were sixteen of the "thirty-nine" fathers who framed the original Constitution. They were John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman, Wm. S. Johnson, Roger Sherman, Robert Morris, Thos. Fitzsimmons, William Few, Abraham Baldwin, Rufus King, William Patterson, George Clymer, Richard Bassett, George Read, Pierce Butler, Daniel Carroll, James Madison.

This shows that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, properly forbade Congress to prohibit slavery in the federal territory; else both their fidelity to correct principle, and their oath to support the Constitution, would have constrained them to oppose the prohibition.

Again, George Washington, another of the "thirty-nine," was then President of the United States, and, as such, approved and signed the bill, thus completing its validity as a law, and thus showing that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government, to control as to slavery in federal territory.

No great while after the adoption of the original Constitution, North Carolina ceded to the Federal Government the country now constituting the State of Tennessee; and a few years later Georgia ceded that which now constitutes the States of Mississippi and Alabama. In both deeds of cession it was made a condition by the ceding States that the Federal Government should not prohibit slavery in the ceded country. Besides this, slavery was then actually in the ceded country. Under these circumstances, Congress, on taking charge of these countries, did not absolutely prohibit slavery within them. But they did interfere with it—take control of it—even there, to a certain extent. In 1798, Congress organized the Territory of Mississippi. In the act of organization they prohibited the bringing of slaves into the Territory, from any place without the United States, by fine, and giving freedom to slaves so brought. This act passed both branches of Congress without

yeas and nays. In that Congress were three of the "thirty-nine" who framed the original Constitution. They were John Langdon, George Reed and Abraham Baldwin. They all, probably, voted for it. Certainly they would have placed their opposition to it upon record, if, in their understanding, any line dividing local from federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in federal territory.

In 1803, the Federal Government purchased the Louisiana country. Our former territorial acquisitions came from certain of our own States; but this Louisiana country was acquired from a foreign nation. In 1804, Congress gave a territorial organization to that part of it which now constitutes the State of Louisiana. New Orleans, lying within that part, was an old and comparatively large city. There were other considerable towns and settlements, and slavery was extensively and thoroughly intermingled with the people. Congress did not, in the Territorial Act, prohibit slavery; but they did interfere with it—take control of it—in a more marked and extensive way than they did in the case of Mississippi. The substance of the provision therein made, in relation to slaves, was:

First. That no slave should be imported into the territory from foreign parts.

Second. That no slave should be carried into it who had been imported into the United States since the first day of May, 1798.

Third. That no slave should be carried into it, except by the owner, and for his own use as a settler; the penalty in all the cases being a fine upon the violator of the law, and freedom to the slave.

This act also was passed without yeas and nays. In the Congress which passed it, there were two of the "thirty-nine." They were Abraham Baldwin and Jonathan Dayton. As stated in the case of Mississippi, it is probable they both voted for it. They would not have allowed it to pass without recording their opposition to it, if, in their understanding, it violated either the line proper dividing local from federal authority or any provision of the Constitution.

In 1819–20, came and passed the Missouri question. Many votes were taken, by yeas and nays, in both branches of Congress, upon the various phases of the general question. Two of the "thirty-nine"—Rufus King and Charles Pinckney—were members of that Congress. Mr. King steadily voted for slavery prohibition and against all compromises, while Mr. Pinckney as steadily voted against slavery prohibition and against all compromises. By this Mr. King showed that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, was violated by Congress prohibiting slavery in federal territory; while Mr. Pinckney, by his votes, showed that in his understanding there was some sufficient reason for opposing such prohibition in that case.

The cases I have mentioned are the only acts of the "thirty-nine," or of any of them, upon the direct issue, which I have been able to discover.

To enumerate the persons who thus acted, as being four in 1784, three in 1787, seventeen in 1789, three in 1798, two in 1804, and two in 1819–20—there would be thirty-one of them. But this would be counting John Langdon, Roger Sherman, William Few, Rufus King, and George Read, each twice, and Abraham Baldwin four times. The true number of those of the "thirty-nine" whom I have shown to have acted upon the question, which, by the text, they understood better than we, is twenty-three, leaving sixteen not shown to have acted upon it in any way.

Here, then, we have twenty-three out of our "thirty-nine" fathers who framed the Government under which we live, who have, upon their official responsibility and their corporal oaths, acted upon the very question which the text affirms they "understood just as well, and even better than we do now;" and twenty-one of them—a clear majority of the whole "thirty-nine"—so acting upon it as to make them guilty of gross political impropriety, and willful perjury, if, in their understanding, any proper division between local and federal authority, or anything in the Constitution they had made themselves, and sworn to support, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the federal territories. Thus the twenty-one acted; and, as actions speak louder than words, so actions under such responsibility speak still louder.

Two of the twenty-three voted against Congressional prohibition of slavery in the federal territories, in the instances in which they

acted upon the question. But for what reasons they so voted is not known. They may have done so because they thought a proper division of local from federal authority, or some provision or principle of the Constitution stood in the way; or they may, without any such question, have voted against the prohibition, on what appeared to them to be sufficient grounds of expediency. No one who has sworn to support the Constitution, can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it; but one may and ought to vote against a measure which he deems constitutional, if, at the same time, he deems it inexpedient. It, therefore, would be unsafe to set down even the two who voted against the prohibition, as having done so because, in their understanding any proper division of local from federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in federal territory.

The remaining sixteen of the "thirty-nine," so far as I have discovered, have left no record of their understanding upon the direct question of federal control of slavery in the federal territories. But there is much reason to believe that their understanding upon that question would not have appeared different from that of their twenty-three compeers, had it been manifested at all.

For the purpose of adhering rigidly to the text, I have purposely omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested, by any person, however distinguished, other than the thirty-nine fathers who framed the original Constitution; and, for the same reason, I have also omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested by any of the "thirty-nine" even, on any other phase of the general question of slavery. If we should look into their acts and declarations on those other phases, as the foreign slave-trade, and the morality and policy of slavery generally, it would appear to us that on the direct question of federal control of slavery in federal territories, the sixteen, if they had acted at all, would probably have acted just as the twenty-three did. Among that sixteen were several of the most noted anti-slavery men of those times—as Dr. Franklin, Alexander Hamilton and Gouverneur Morris—while there was not one now known to have been otherwise, unless it may be John Rutledge, of South Carolina.

The sum of the whole is, that of our "thirty-nine" fathers who framed the original Constitution, twenty-one—a clear majority of the whole—certainly understood that no proper division of local from federal authority, nor any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control slavery in the federal territories; while all the rest probably had the same understanding. Such, unquestionably, was the understanding of our fathers who framed the original Constitution; and the text affirms that they understood the question better than we.

But, so far, I have been considering the understanding of the question manifested by the framers of the original Constitution. In and by the original instrument, a mode was provided for amending it; and as I have already stated, the present frame of Government under which we live consists of that original, and twelve amendatory articles framed and adopted since. Those who now insist that federal control of slavery in federal territories violates the Constitution, point us to the provisions which they suppose it thus violates; and, as I understand, they all fix upon provisions in these amendatory articles, and not in the original instrument. The Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case, plant themselves upon the fifth amendment, which provides that "no person shall be deprived of property without due process of law;" while Senator Douglas and his peculiar adherents plant themselves upon the tenth amendment, providing that "the powers not granted by the Constitution are reserved to the States respectively, and to the people."

Now, it so happens that these amendments were framed by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution—the identical Congress which passed the act already mentioned, enforcing the prohibition of slavery in the northwestern territory. Not only was it the same Congress, but they were the identical, same individual men who, at the same session, and at the same time within the session, had under consideration, and in progress toward maturity, these constitutional amendments, and this act prohibiting slavery in all the territory the nation then owned. The Constitutional amendments were introduced before, and passed after the act enforcing the Ordinance of '87; so that

during the whole pendency of the act to enforce the Ordinance, the Constitutional amendments were also pending.

That Congress, consisting in all of seventy-six members, including sixteen of the framers of the original Constitution, as before stated, were pre-eminently our fathers who framed that part of the Government under which we live, which is now claimed as forbidding the Federal Government to control slavery in the Federal territories.

Is it not a little presumptuous in any one at this day to affirm that the two things which that Congress deliberately framed, and carried to maturity at the same time, are absolutely inconsistent with each other? And does not such affirmation become impudently absurd when coupled with the other affirmation, from the same mouth, that those who did the two things alleged to be inconsistent understood whether they really were inconsistent better than we—better than he who affirms that they are inconsistent?

It is surely safe to assume that the "thirty-nine" framers of the original Constitution, and the seventy-six members of the Congress which framed the amendments thereto, taken together, do certainly include those who may be fairly called "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live." And so assuming, I defy any man to show that any one of them ever, in his whole life, declared that, in his understanding, any proper division of local from federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the federal territories. I go a step further. I defy any one to show that any living man in the whole world ever did, prior to the beginning of the present century (and I might almost say prior to the beginning of the last half of the present century), declare that, in his understanding, any proper division of local from federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the federal territories. To those who now so declare, I give, not only "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live," but with them all other living men within the century in which it was framed, among whom to search, and they shall not be able to find the evidence of a single man agreeing with them.

Now, and here, let me guard a little against being misunderstood. I do not mean to say we are bound to follow implicitly in whatever our fathers did. To do so, would be to discard all the lights of current experience—to reject all progress—all improvement. What I do say is, that if we would supplant the opinions and policy of our fathers in any case, we should do so upon evidence so conclusive, and argument so clear, that even their great authority, fairly considered and weighed, cannot stand; and most surely not in a case whereof we ourselves declare they understood the question better than we.

If any man, at this day, sincerely believes that a proper division of local from federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbids the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the federal territories, he is right to say so, and to enforce his position by all truthful evidence and fair argument which he can. But he has no right to mislead others, who have less access to history and less leisure to study it, into the false belief that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live," were of the same opinion—thus substituting falsehood and deception for truthful evidence and fair argument. If any man at this day sincerely believes "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live," used and applied principles, in other cases, which ought to have led them to understand that a proper division of local from federal authority or some part of the Constitution, forbids the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the federal territories, he is right to say so. But he should, at the same time, brave the responsibility of declaring that, in his opinion, he understands their principles better than they did themselves; and especially should he not shirk that responsibility by asserting that they "understood the question just as well, and even better, than we do now."

But enough. Let all who believe that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better than we do now," speak as they spoke, and act as they acted upon it. This is all Republicans ask—all Republicans desire—in relation to slavery. As those fathers marked it, so let it be again marked, as an evil not to be extended, but to be tolerated and protected only because of and so far as its actual presence among us makes that toleration and protection a necessity. Let all the guaranties those fathers gave it, be, not grudgingly, but fully and fairly, maintained. For this Re-

publicans contend, and with this, so far as I know or believe, they will be content.

And now, if they would listen—as I suppose they will not—I would address a few words to the southern people.

I would say to them: You consider yourselves a reasonable and a just people; and I consider that in the general qualities of reason and justice you are not inferior to any other people. Still, when you speak of us Republicans, you do so only to denounce us as reptiles, or, at the best as no better than outlaws. You will grant a hearing to pirates or murderers, but nothing like it to "Black Republicans." In all your contentions with one another, each of you deems an unconditional condemnation of "Black Republicanism" as the first thing to be attended to. Indeed, such condemnation of us seems to be an indispensable pre-requisite—license, so to speak—among you to be admitted or permitted to speak at all. Now can you, or not, be prevailed upon to pause and to consider whether this is quite just to us, or even to yourselves?

Bring forward your charges and specifications, and then be patient long enough to hear us deny or justify.

You say we are sectional. We deny it. That makes an issue; and the burden of proof is upon you. You produce your proof; and what is it? Why, that our party has no existence in your section—gets no votes in your section. The fact is substantially true; but does it prove the issue? If it does, then in case we should, without change of principle, begin to get votes in your section, we should thereby cease to be sectional. You cannot escape this conclusion; and yet, are you willing to abide by it? If you are, you will probably soon find that we have ceased to be sectional, for we shall get votes in your section this very year. You will then begin to discover, as the truth plainly is, that your proof does not touch the issue. The fact that we get no votes in your section is a fact of your making, and not of ours. And if there be fault in that fact, that fault is primarily yours, and remains so until you show that we repel you by some wrong principle or practice. If we do repel you by any wrong principle or practice, the fault is ours: but this brings you to where you ought to have started—to a discussion of the right or wrong of our principle. If our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section for the benefit of ours, or for any other object, then our principle, and we with it, are sectional, and are justly opposed and denounced as such. Meet us, then, on the question of whether our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section; and so meet it as if it were possible that something may be said on our side. Do you accept the challenge? No? Then you really believe that the principle which our fathers who framed the Government under which we live thought so clearly right as to adopt it, and indorse it, again and again, upon their official oaths, is, in fact so clearly wrong as to demand your condemnation without a moment's consideration.

Some of you delight to flaunt in our faces the warning against sectional parties given by Washington in his Farewell Address. Less than eight years before Washington gave that warning, he had, as President of the United States approved and signed an act of Congress, enforcing the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory, which act embodied the policy of the Government upon that subject, up to and at the very moment he penned that warning; and about one year after he penned it he wrote Lafayette that he considered that prohibition a wise measure, expressing in the same connection his hope that we should some time have a confederacy of free States.

Bearing this in mind, and seeing that sectionalism has since arisen upon this same subject, is that warning a weapon in your hands against us, or in our hands against you? Could Washington himself speak, would he cast the blame of that sectionalism upon us, who sustain his policy, or upon you who repudiate it? We respect that warning of Washington, and we commend it to you, together with his example pointing to the right application of it.

But you say you are conservative—eminently conservative—while we are revolutionary, destructive, or something of the sort. What is conservatism? Is it not adherence to the old and tried, against the new and untried? We stick to, contend for, the identical old policy on the point in controversy which was adopted by our fathers who framed the Government under which we live, while you with one accord reject, and scout, and spit upon that old policy, and insist upon substituting something new. True, you disagree among yourselves as to what that substitute shall be. You have considerable variety of new propositions and plans, but you are unanimous in rejecting and denouncing the old policy of the fathers. Some of you are for reviving the for-

eign slave-trade; some for a Congressional Slave-Code for the Territories; some for Congress forbidding the Territories to prohibit Slavery within their limits; some for maintaining Slavery in the Territories through the Judiciary; some for the "gur-reat pur-rinciple" that "if one man would enslave another, no third man should object," fantastically called "Popular Sovereignty;" but never a man among you in favor of federal prohibition of slavery in federal territories, according to the practice of our fathers who framed the Government under which we live. Not one of all your various plans can show a precedent or an advocate in the century within which our Government originated. Consider, then, whether your claim of conservatism for yourselves, and your charge of destructiveness against us, are based on the most clear and stable foundations.

Again, you say we have made the slavery question more prominent than it formerly was. We deny it. We admit that it is more prominent, but we deny that we made it so. It was not we, but you, who discarded the old policy of the fathers. We resisted, and still resist, your innovation; and thence comes the greater prominence of the question. Would you have that question reduced to its former proportions? Go back to that old policy. What has been will be again, under the same conditions. If you would have the peace of the old times, re-adopt the precepts and policy of the old times.

You charge that we stir up insurrections among your slaves. We deny it; and what is your proof? Harper's Ferry! John Brown!! John Brown was no Republican; and you have failed to implicate a single Republican in his Harper's Ferry enterprise. If any member of our party is guilty in that matter, you know it or you do not know it. If you do know it, you are inexcusable to not designate the man, and prove the fact. If you do not know it, you are inexcusable to assert it, and especially to persist in the assertion after you have tried and failed to make the proof. You need not be told that persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true, is simply malicious slander.

Some of you admit that no Republican designedly aided or encouraged the Harper's Ferry affair; but still insist that our doctrines and declarations necessarily lead to such results. We do not believe it. We know we hold to no doctrine, and make no declarations, which were not held to and made by our fathers who framed the Government under which we live. You never dealt fairly by us in relation to this affair. When it occurred, some important State elections were near at hand, and you were in evident glee with the belief that, by charging the blame upon us, you could get an advantage of us in those elections. The elections came, and your expectations were not quite fulfilled. Every Republican man knew that, as to himself at least, your charge was a slander, and he was not much inclined by it to cast his vote in your favor. Republican doctrines and declarations are accompanied with a continual protest against any interference whatever with your slaves, or with you about your slaves. Surely, this does not encourage them to revolt. True, we do, in common with our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live, declare our belief that slavery is wrong; but the slaves do not hear us declare even this. For anything we say or do, the slaves would scarcely know there is a Republican party. I believe they would not, in fact, generally know it but for your misrepresentations of us, in their hearing. In your political contests among yourselves, each faction charges the other with sympathy with Black Republicanism; and then, to give point to the charge, defines Black Republicanism to simply be insurrection, blood and thunder among the slaves.

Slave insurrections are no more common now than they were before the Republican party was organized. What induced the Southampton insurrection, twenty-eight years ago, in which, at least, three times as many lives were lost as at Harper's Ferry? You can scarcely stretch your very elastic fancy to the conclusion that Southampton was got up by Black Republicanism. In the present state of things in the United States, I do not think a general, or even a very extensive slave insurrection is possible. The indispensable concert of action cannot be attained. The slaves have no means of rapid communication; nor can incendiary free men, black or white, supply it. The explosive materials are everywhere in parcels; but there neither are, nor can be supplied, the indispensable connecting trains.

Much is said by southern people about the affection of slaves for their masters and mistresses; and a part of it, at least, is true. A plot for an uprising could scarcely be devised

and communicated to twenty individuals before some one of them, to save the life of a favorite master or mistress, would divulge it. This is the rule; and the slave revolution in Hayti was not an exception to it, but a case occurring under peculiar circumstances. The gunpowder-plot of British history, though not connected with slaves, was more in point. In that case, only about twenty were admitted to the secret; and yet one of them, in his anxiety to save a friend, betrayed the plot to that friend, and, by consequence, averted the calamity. Occasional poisonings from the kitchen, and open or stealthy assassinations in the field, and local revolts extending to a score or so, will continue to occur as the natural results of slavery; but no general insurrection of slaves, as I think, can happen in this country for a long time. Whoever much fears, or much hopes, for such an event, will be alike disappointed.

In the language of Mr. Jefferson, uttered many years ago, "It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation, and deportation, peaceably, and in such slow degrees, as that the evil will wear off insensibly; and their places be, *pari passu*, filled up by free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect held up."

Mr. Jefferson did not mean to say, nor do I, that the power of emancipation is in the Federal Government. He spoke of Virginia; and, as to the power of emancipation, I speak of the slaveholding States only.

The Federal Government, however, as we insist, has the power of restraining the extension of the institution—the power to insure that a slave insurrection shall never occur on any American soil which is now free from slavery.

John Brown's effort was peculiar. It was not a slave insurrection. It was an attempt by white men to get up a revolt among slaves, in which the slaves refused to participate. In fact, it was so absurd that the slaves, with all their ignorance, saw plainly enough it could not succeed. That affair, in its philosophy, corresponds with the many attempts, related in history, at the assassination of kings and emperors. An enthusiast broods over the oppression of a people till he fancies himself commissioned by Heaven to liberate them. He ventures the attempt, which ends in little else than in his own execution. Orsini's attempt on Louis Napoleon, and John Brown's attempt at Harper's Ferry, were, in their philosophy, precisely the same. The eagerness to cast blame on Old England in the one case, and on New England in the other, does not disprove the sameness of the two things.

And how much would it avail you, if you could, by the use of John Brown, Helper's book, and the like, break up the Republican organization? Human action can be modified to some extent, but human nature cannot be changed. There is a judgment and a feeling against slavery in this nation, which cast at least a million and a half of votes. You cannot destroy that judgment and feeling—that sentiment—by breaking up the political organization which rallies around it. You can scarcely scatter and disperse an army which has been formed into order in the face of your heaviest fire, but if you could, how much would you gain by forcing the sentiment which created it out of the peaceful channel of the ballot box, into some other channel? What would that other channel probably be? Would the number of John Browns be lessened or enlarged by the operation?

But you will break up the Union rather than submit to a denial of your Constitutional rights.

That has a somewhat reckless sound; but it would be palliated, if not fully justified, were we proposing, by the mere force of numbers, to deprive you of some right, plainly written down in the Constitution. But we are proposing no such thing.

When you make these declarations, you have a specific and well-understood allusion to an assumed Constitutional right of yours, to take slaves into the federal territories, and to hold them there as property. But no such right is specifically written in the Constitution. That instrument is literally silent about any such right. We, on the contrary, deny that such a right has any existence in the Constitution, even by implication.

Your purpose, then, plainly stated, is, that you will destroy the Government, unless you be allowed to construe and enforce the Constitution as you please, on all points in dispute between you and us. You will rule or ruin in all events.

This, plainly stated, is your language to us. Perhaps you will say the Supreme Court has decided the disputed Constitutional question in your favor. Not quite so. But waiving the

lawyer's distinction between dictum and decision, the Courts have decided the question for you in a sort of way. The Courts have substantially said, it is your Constitutional right to take slaves into the federal territories, and to hold them there as property.

When I say the decision was made in a sort of way, I mean it was made in a divided Court by a bare majority of the Judges, and they not quite agreeing with one another in the reasons for making it; that it is so made as that its avowed supporters disagree with one another about its meaning; and that it was mainly based upon a mistaken statement of fact—the statement in the opinion that "the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution."

An inspection of the Constitution will show that the right of property in a slave is not distinctly and expressly affirmed in it. Bear in mind the Judges do not pledge their judicial opinion that such right is impliedly affirmed in the Constitution; but they pledge their veracity that it is distinctly and expressly affirmed there—"expressly" that is, not mingled with anything else—"distinctly" that is, in words meaning just that, without the aid of any inference, and susceptible of no other meaning.

If they had only pledged their judicial opinion that such right is affirmed in the instrument by implication, it would be open to others to show that neither the word "slave" nor "slavery" is to be found in the Constitution, nor the word "property" even, in any connection with language alluding to the things slave, or slavery, and that wherever in that instrument the slave is alluded to, he is called a "person;" and wherever his master's legal right in relation to him is alluded to, it is spoken of as "service or labor due," as a "debt" payable in service or labor. Also, it would be open to show, by contemporaneous history, that this mode of alluding to slaves and slavery, instead of speaking of them, was employed on purpose to exclude from the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man.

To show all this is easy and certain.

When this obvious mistake of the Judges shall be brought to their notice, is it not reasonable to expect that they will withdraw the mistaken statement, and reconsider the conclusion based upon it?

And then it is to be remembered that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live"—the men who made the Constitution—decided this same Constitutional question in our favor, long ago—decided it without a division among themselves, when making the decision; without division among themselves about the meaning of it after it was made, and so far as any evidence is left, without basing it upon any mistaken statement of facts.

Under all these circumstances, do you really feel yourselves justified to break up this Government, unless such a court decision as yours is shall be at once submitted to as a conclusive and final rule of political action?

But you will not abide the election of a Republican President. In that supposed event, you say, you will destroy the Union; and then, you say, the great crime of having destroyed it will be upon us!

That is cool. A highwayman holds a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth, "stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murderer!"

To be sure, what the robber demanded of me—my money—was my own; and I had a clear right to keep it; but it was no more my own than my vote is my own; and the threat of death to me, to extort my money, and the threat of destruction to the Union, to extort my vote, can scarcely be distinguished in principle.

A few words now to Republicans. It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace, and in harmony, one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands, and yield to them if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them?

Will they be satisfied if the Territories be unconditionally surrendered to them? We know they will not. In all their present complaints against us, the Territories are scarcely mentioned. Invasions and insurrections are the rage now. Will it satisfy them if, in the future, we have nothing to do with invasions and insurrections? We know it will not. We so know because we know we never had anything to do with invasions and insurrections; and yet this total abstaining does not exempt us from the charge and the denunciation.

The question recurs, what will satisfy them? Simply this: We must not only let them alone, but we must, somehow, convince them that we do let them alone. This, we know by experience, is no easy task. We have been so trying to convince them, from the very beginning of our organization, but with no success. In all our platforms and speeches we have constantly protested our purpose to let them alone; but this has had no tendency to convince them. Alike unavailing to convince them is the fact that they have never detected a man of us in any attempt to disturb them.

These natural, and apparently adequate means all failing, what will convince them? This, and this only: cease to call slavery *wrong*, and join them in calling it *right*. And this must be done thoroughly—done in *acts* as well as in *words*. Silence will not be tolerated—we must place ourselves avowedly with them. Douglas's new sedition law must be enacted and enforced, suppressing all declarations that slavery is wrong, whether made in politics in presses, in pulpits, or in private. We must arrest and return their fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure. We must pull down our Free-State constitutions. The whole atmosphere must be disinfected from all taint of opposition to slavery, before they will cease to believe that all their troubles proceed from us.

I am quite aware they do not state their case precisely in this way. Most of them would probably say to us, "Let us alone, do nothing to us, and say what you please about slavery." But we do let them alone—have never disturbed them—so that, after all it is what we say, which dissatisfies them. They will continue to accuse us of doing, until we cease saying.

I am also aware they have not, as yet, in terms, demanded the overthrow of our Free-State Constitutions. Yet those Constitutions declare the wrong of slavery, with more solemn emphasis, than do all other sayings against it; and when all these others sayings shall have been silenced, the overthrow of these Constitutions will be demanded, and nothing be left to resist the demand. It is nothing to the contrary, that they do not demand the whole of this just now. Demanding what they do, and for the reason they do, they can voluntarily stop nowhere short of this consummation. Holding, as they do, that slavery is morally right, and socially elevating, they cannot cease to demand a full national recognition of it, as a legal right, and a social blessing.

Nor can we justifiably withhold this, on any ground save our conviction that slavery is wrong. If slavery is right, all words, acts, laws, and constitutions against it, are themselves wrong, and should be silenced, and swept away. If it is right, we cannot justly object to its nationality—its universality; if it is wrong, they cannot justly insist upon its extension—its enlargement. All they ask, we could readily grant, if we thought slavery right; all we ask, they could as readily grant, if they thought it wrong. Their thinking it right, and our thinking it wrong, is the precise fact upon which depends the whole controversy. Thinking it right, as they do, they are not to blame for desiring its full recognition, as being right; but thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to them? Can we cast our votes with their view, and against our own? In view of our moral, social, and political responsibilities, can we do this?

Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the nation; but can we, while our votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the National Territories, and to overrun us here in these Free States?

If our sense of duty forbids this, then let us stand by our duty, fearlessly and effectively. Let us be diverted by none of those sophistical contrivances wherewith we are so industriously plied and belabored—contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong, vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man—such as a policy of "don't care" on a question about which all true men do care—such as Union appeals beseeching true Union men to yield to Disunionists, reversing the divine rule, and calling, not the sinners, but the righteous to repentance—such as invocations to Washington, imploring men to unsay what Washington said, and undo what Washington did.

Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty, as we understand it.

State Rights and the Supreme Court.

SPEECH

OF

SENATOR DOOLITTLE,

OF WISCONSIN,

Delivered in the United States Senate, February 24, 1860.

Mr. President: It is reported of John Quincy Adams that he once said to his friends, that the best thing ever uttered by Andrew Jackson, was that when he swore to support the Constitution, he swore to support it as he understood it. I shall make no apology to-day for the Supreme Court of Wisconsin for construing the Constitution of the United States, as upon their official oaths, and according to their own convictions. It needs none; and no Senator has a right to demand one, and least of all a Senator from the State of Georgia. The Supreme Court of Georgia, as late as 1854, not six months before the decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, of which he complains, upon a long and able review of this whole controversy, summed up by declaring:

"The conclusion is that the Supreme Court of Georgia is co-equal and co-ordinate with the Supreme Court of the United States; and not inferior and subordinate to that court. That as to the reserved powers, the State Court is Supreme; that as to the delegated powers, the United States Court is Supreme; as to powers, both delegated and reserved, the concurrent powers of both courts, in the language of Hamilton, 'are equally supreme,' and that as a consequence the Supreme Court of the United States has no jurisdiction over the Supreme Court of Georgia, and cannot, therefore, give it an order, or make for it a precedent."

Wisconsin has never gone to that length; she has never yet denied the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, in cases acknowledged to arise under the Constitution of the United States. She has only asserted her right to judge for herself as to what powers are delegated, and what reserved by it; and upon that question her Supreme Court is co-equal and co-ordinate with the Supreme Court of the United States, and not inferior or subordinate to that court. If the Supreme Court of Wisconsin has erred in assuming this power to judge for itself independently of the Supreme Court of the United States, who taught her that important lesson? The Resolutions of 1798; every Democratic platform for the last twenty years; the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in 1798; the unanimous opinion of the Court of Appeals, the Court of last resort, in Virginia, in 1814; the whole judicial history of Georgia—now, or soon to become the Empire State of the South. (Mr. Doolittle here read from the Resolutions of 1798, and the history of the controversy in Georgia, showing that the State of Georgia denied altogether the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States, and treated that court with most profound contempt.) I do not question, and have no right to question the integrity or good faith of the action of the sovereignties of Georgia. I do not indulge, either as a matter of taste or inclination, in impugning the motives of men in high official station, acting on the solemnity of their oaths. The motto of old England has too much truth and significance for me to do so, either in public or private life; besides, sir, having been reared in the Republican school of Jefferson and Jackson, and maintaining, as I now do, every principle taught in that school, and which, I believe, are identical with those of the Republican party of to-day—I see many things in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Georgia

to command my respect. The representatives from those States who have taught Wisconsin, one of the "youngest sisters," to think for herself, and to be true to her convictions, should be among the last to censure or condemn her. I come now to the consideration of the precise point at issue between the Senator (Toombs) and myself as it stands upon the record, and as made up by himself. When I first moved the postponement of this subject, the issue stood in these words on the record, and as I understood it:

"DOOLITTLE—The assumption of the Senator from Georgia in a single word depends entirely upon the question whether the law of Congress be or be not constitutional.

"TOOMBS—Certainly, sir.

"DOOLITTLE—If the law is unconstitutional, the whole proceedings in the District Court of Wisconsin is a nullity.

"TOOMBS—Yes, sir.

"DOOLITTLE—But if your law is constitutional, then the proceeding of the Court of Wisconsin was wrong.

"TOOMBS—I have nothing to say to that now."

The next morning, however, the Senator from Georgia corrected the record, and the issue was re-stated in these words:

"TOOMBS—Whether or not the law was constitutional, the proceeding of the State Court of Wisconsin I hold to be wrong. That did not depend upon the question whether the Fugitive Slave Law was constitutional or not, and in any event the District Court of the United States for Wisconsin, having had jurisdiction, there was no power to seize a person from prison under the habeas corpus and reverse the proceedings of the Court having competent jurisdiction, and so much of the report as makes me admit that in any event, whether the Fugitive Slave Law is constitutional or not, the proceeding of the Court of Wisconsin is right, is erroneous.

"DOOLITTLE—I sha l not go into the discussion of this question now, as I propose to discuss that point on a future occasion; but simply desire to say, if the Senator from Georgia admits the law of Congress is unconstitutional, the District Court has no jurisdiction under it, and the proposition which the gentleman submits, and the distinction which he makes, that a law can be unconstitutional, and a nullity itself, and yet the court have jurisdiction under an unconstitutional law, is in my judgment, preposterous.

"TOOMBS—I merely wished to state my position, not to argue it; I am prepared to argue it at any proper time."

The issue is cleary made on both sides, and now fairly understood. It is a question of constitutional law, addressed to the judgment, to the calm reason, in the discussion of which passion and declamation are of no avail. It is a question of more consequence than the slavery question, and can be discussed entirely free from all the excitements surrounding that question. The question is of the jurisdiction or authority conferred on the District Court of the United States by an unconstitutional law. I thank the gentleman for thus restating the issue: he concedes, in my judgment, the very ground on which the Supreme Court of the United States based their decision in 21 Howard. [Mr. D. read extract.] Upon the assumption taken by the United States Supreme Court, that the Fugitive Slave Law is constitutional, the conclusion at which they arrive follows irresistibly that a person arrested under it would be imprisoned under the authority of the United States, and a State Court on habeas corpus must remand him into custody, for he would be under legal restraint. To take the other assumption, that it is not constitutional, a person arrested under it would be imprisoned without authority of the United States, and the State Court on a habeas corpus must discharge him, because he is under no legal restraint. What is the issue on the hearing of a habeas corpus case? The jurisdiction of the court in such a case is not appellate; not for review; not to reverse the judgment of other tribunals, but it is a suit to inquire into the cause of the imprisonment of a citizen, and if illegal, to discharge him. The very essence of the issue is, is his imprisonment legal or illegal? with, or without law? That is the question. Let us for once take the negro out of the question, and forget that slaves or slavery ever existed. A habeas corpus case is a collateral suit in which the proceedings and judgments of other courts are inquired into just to the same extent as they are inquired into upon actions for false imprisonment or in suits upon a judgment.

To test the position assumed by the Senator, he says, "Concede the Fugitive Slave Law to be unconstitutional, and still the District Court of the United States for Wisconsin had competent jurisdiction." What a solecism! All the world knows that the United States District Court has a special and limited jurisdiction, and only so much as the law of Congress under the Constitution confers; all else is reserved to the State courts. An unconstitutional law is no law—it is a mere nullity. The Constitution goes with every enactment annulling every provision repugnant to itself; it is the Constitution which breathes into it the breath of life; every law is enacted with a proviso implying that it is not repugnant to the Constitution; in the cant phrase, it has force "subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Hold a man in prison under the authority of the United States, when the Constitution, the source of all authority, forbids it! Go tell the people of Georgia that her Senator contends that a law of Congress can give to a United States District Court competent jurisdiction over a subject matter which the Constitution itself forbids! That is higher-law doctrine for you with a vengeance! The courts, then, are above, and not under the Constitution! Bring this doctrine to a practical test, and suppose

Congress, under the general-welfare doctrine, should enact a law, and confer general original jurisdiction of all suits of law or in equity, and between citizens of the same State; one citizen of a State commences an action against another for slander in the United States District Court; a trial is had, judgment rendered, the defendant arrested upon the execution; upon a petition to the State court for a habeas corpus, the petitioner complains that he is restrained of his liberty without any legal cause. The return on its face shows that he is held under the pretended authority of the Court of the United States. The answer of the petitioner at once is, that the law under which he is held is a nullity, is unconstitutional, it is upon a subject matter which the Constitution itself expressly forbids, and therefore the court which rendered the judgment had no jurisdiction, had no authority to imprison the person of a citizen. Is not that a sufficient answer? Or suppose the case to be an action for false imprisonment brought against the Marshal, would not the State be compelled to pass on the constitutionality of the law, and declare the court had no jurisdiction? Without jurisdiction in the court there could be no judgment; the whole proceeding is *Coram non judice*. It is begging the whole question; reasoning in a circle. It is like saying the world stands upon an elephant, the elephant on a turtle, and the turtle on nothing. Does a court have jurisdiction by its own mere *ipse dixit?* Take the case of the United States District Court of Wisconsin, and see where this doctrine would lead. We have no Circuit Judge of the United States. Our District Judge holds both District and Circuit Court; there can be no division of opinion in the court, and therefore no appeal. It is with no disrespect to the Judge of this Court that I say that the same Judge may indict, try, and sentence, even to death, any man, woman, or child in Wisconsin, and there is practically no appeal to any other Court of the United States. Add this doctrine of the Senator from Georgia, and there would be no constitutional limit upon his power—whether constitutional or unconstitutional—whether within or without the authority of the United States; whether within or outside of his constitutional jurisdiction, with or without cause, by his warrant alone he could arrest any citizen of Wisconsin, try him, sentence him, even to death, and there is no appeal. No habeas corpus could reach the prisoner, whether in the State Prison or at the foot of the gallows! Where are we? In the United States of America, or at St. Petersburg, under the power of an autocrat, whose will is law; or under the Constitution of the United States, which declares that no person shall be deprived of his liberty but by due process of law, which law must itself be subject always to the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. Doolittle then referred to the character of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, the Judges of which were chosen before the organization of the Republican party, and paid an eloquent tribute to the worth, probity, and high judicial character of Chief Justice Whiton, deceased; referred to the opinions in the cases of Ableman, Booth, and Rycraft, in 3d Wisconsin Reports. He gave a history of the cases growing out of the rescue of a fugitive from Missouri in 1854, for which Booth was arrested by United States Marshal Ableman. After a hearing, Booth was discharged on writ of habeas corpus, on *four* grounds; because the warrant on its face did not state any offence under the act; because the act itself was repugnant to the Constitution, in clothing mere Commissioners with judicial powers, and also denying a jury trial to a person claiming to be a free inhabitant of Wisconsin, and because the Constitution gives Congress no power to legislate on that subject. Afterward, Booth and Rycraft were rearrested, and convicted in the District Court, but discharged on a hearing before a full bench of the Supreme Court; read from the opinions, 1 Justices Crawford and Whiton, 3d Wisconsin Reports, pp. 79, 80, 81, 82; also, 66, 68; also, 175–6–7–8. He continued—Question his opinions if you will, confute them if you can; but where, I ask, is any evidence to be found in the opinions, of bad faith, or corruption in office, of official "perjury;" of raising his "blood-stained hands over a violated Constitution." That Senator (Toombs) owes it to himself, to this Senate, to the State of Wisconsin, to the sacred memory of the dead, to take back every word that he has uttered, calculated to impugn in the least degree the uprightness and integrity of that Judge who pronounced the decision of which he complains. [He read further from opinions of Judge Smith, 3d Wisconsin Report, pp. 13, 23, 193–4, 114, 116–17, 119–20–21]. Mr. D. commended these entire opinions to the Senate and the country as opinions of able Judges, thoughtful and earnest men, grap-

pling with the gravest questions underlying the whole system of Government. He admitted that had he been consulted, as a lawyer, at that time, as to the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of the rendition of fugitives from service, he should have declared in favor of that power. Since then, however, by the able discussion of the subject in his own State, and by his own careful attention, he now agreed with Justice Smith and his colleagues of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin.

Mr. Webster also maintained the same opinion, that it belonged to the States and not to Congress to legislate on the subject. Such, also, he understood to have been the opinion of Mr. Calhoun and Judge Butler of South Carolina, as to the original question; and such, it seemed to him, must be the true construction of all persons, brought up in the school of sturdy old Republicanism. In his opinion, a large majority of the Republicans of Wisconsin approved of the decision of the Court. Many Democrats also, brought up in the school of Jefferson and Jackson, sustained the action of the Court in interpreting the Constitution as they understood it. It was not a strict party question in Wisconsin. The doctrine of the Senator from Georgia, as to the power of the Supreme Court, led to absolutism and despotism. It is the tendency of the Judicial authority to usurp legislative powers. He quoted from Mr. Buchanan, that the judges always lean to the prerogative of power, and contrasted the difference between the views of Judge Marshall as a member of the Constitutional Convention and as Chief Justice of the United States. He also contrasted Judge Taney as Secretary under Jackson, sustaining him in his position that he should administer the Constitution as he understood it, and Taney as Chief Justice, leaning toward the consolidation of federal power. The Supreme Court now asserted the legality of slavery in the Territories, and the next plank added to the Democratic platform would be the declaration at Charleston of the infallibility of the Supreme Court. In the headstrong zeal pursued by the other party to force slavery in the Territories they have ceased to be Republicans, and become advocates of the most federal doctrine of the old federal party against which Jefferson uttered his loudest thunders. He quoted Jefferson's opinion of the Supreme Court, in which he held that it sought, by sapping and mining, to subvert the Constitution and press us into one Consolidated Government. The great question in the science of American Government was, when the jurisdiction of the State and Federal Governments came in conflict. Who was to decide? It would never do to say that the decisions of the Federal Courts should be received as final and conclusive. When it usurps power its decisions must not be respected, and are binding upon nobody. When a State and the United States differ, there is no common umpire but the people. He beheld a party calling itself Democratic, in face of its own platform, now bowing down to worship at the feet of an imperial court, and which had asserted this new doctrine of judicial infallibility, of "immaculate decision," in order to irrevocably fix slavery in the Territories.

MEDARY'S VETO.

"Popular Sovereignty" in the Territories, as embodied in Douglas's Nebraska Bill and Buchanan's electioneering pledge to leave them "perfectly free" to do as they pleased on the subject, was already a stale joke; but Gov. Medary's late veto has given it a new and vivid elucidation.

We presume there are not many Americans who can read who are unaware that the people of Kansas are hostile to Human Slavery. They have said so in every election held in their Territory since 1854, when they were not overborne by border ruffian invasion; they said so emphatically in their overwhelming vote to reject the Lecompton Constitution; they said it again in calling, then in electing the Constitional Convention which met last summer at Wyandot; and yet again in ratifying the Constitution there made; and still again in electing the Free State Ticket to compose and organize a State Government under that Constitution. Gov. Medary ought certainly to be aware of all this; for he has fought it step by step, and was the opposing candidate for Governor at the late election, and badly beaten.

Yet Kansas is still constructively a Slave Territory—"as much slaveholding as Alabama or Georgia," says President Buchanan. A very few slaves, we understand, are still held there, in pro-slavery nooks and corners, and a slave was not long since advertised for sale on an execution for debt in Leavenworth county. The Territorial Legislature tried last year to abolish slavery, but the Governor baffled them; and *this* year's Legislature returned to the charge, passing, by a large majority, a bill which reads thus:

An Act to Abolish Slavery.

Section 1. *Be it enacted, &c.*, That slavery or involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, is and shall be forever abolished in this Territory.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

That is a short act, and not hard to understand. Let us look first at the dignified grounds on which President Buchanan's Governor bases his veto of it:

To the Honorable, the House of Representatives:

Gentlemen: I have received the bill entitled, "An Act to Prohibit Slavery in Kansas," and, not satisfied that it accomplishes what its title imports, I return it, with reasons.

This bill appears to be more political than practical; more for the purpose of obtaining men's opinions than for any benefit or injury it can be to any one. I am the more fully convinced of this, from the articles which have appeared in the organs of the Republican party in this Territory, which, it is proper to presume, speak by authority of those they represent. Two of the papers before me call upon you to pass this bill, to see what I may say, and compel me to act in the premises. "The Republican," of this place, is very emphatic, and "The Champion," of Atchison City, edited by the Secretary of the Wyandot Constitutional Convention, "*dares*" you repeatedly to fail in sending this bill to me, to get my action upon it for political purposes.

"The Republican" says: "We want to test Gov. Medary."

"The Champion" says: "If Medary will take the responsibility of vetoing it, pass it over his head, and then let them bring the subject before the courts, and have Judge Taney make another advance in his theories respecting the constitution. We shall see, then, what these Democrats, who howl about 'as-good-Free-State-men-as-you-are,' will do when called upon to act. And we shall see whether there is anything in their professions of 'Squatter Sovereignty.'"

Always willing to accommodate political opponents, as well as friends, with my views on politics or any other subject, I accept the invitation with pleasure, and offer this as an apology for the extent I may go in satisfying so generous a demand.

Of course—since Governors are but men, and often very small men—bills have doubtless been vetoed ere now on grounds as frivolous and irrelevant as these; but we doubt that any Governor was ever till now foolish enough to make such avowals.

We wish we could make room for the whole of this unique and facetious Veto Message, but its inordinate length forbids. It embodies a synopsis of the political history of our country, as seen through the Medary spectacles—tracing the descent of the Republicans from the Tories of the Revolution, and proving that the Federalists and New England men were always wrong, unpatriotic, short-sighted and anti-progressive, while the Democrats were just the opposite—*ergo*, the Legislature of Kansas have no right to abolish slavery! A Territorial has a great deal more power than a State Legislature, but not enough to enable it to decree that one man shall not legally and rightfully sell another man's innocent wife and children by auction to the highest bidder! Coming at length somewhere near the matter in controversy, Gov. Medary says:

There is a misapprehension of terms, in saying that the Constitution of the United States carries slavery into Territories, or any kind of property. The Constitution only protects property when carried there, and all contracts, obligations and agreements between man and man. It is not a respecter of persons or property, but operates with equal force upon all, and in the absence of the exercise of sovereignty in such Territory, it is authoritative in the protection of all. A Constitution protective not creative. A Territorial Legislature might refuse to pass laws to punish horse-thieves, yet my horses are as much mine as before, and would still be mine if stolen, and I would have a right to sell him, if I could get a purchaser.

The Constitution of the United States extends over all the persons and property of the country and far out into the sea. It knows no distinctions and cannot know any. Sorghum, quite a new thing in Kansas, and unknown to the country when the Constitution was adopted, is just as much property as Indian corn. It is most remarkable that it never suggested itself to any one to pass a local law declaring Sorghum property, and securing it to the possession of the holder, so as to make it theft to steal it.

Clear as mud, you see; only it don't explain how the Lord came to make such egregious fools as Mansfield, Brougham, and other jurists, who have adjudged that the ownership of one man by another is not so natural and indefeasible as his ownership of a horse or donkey. Can it be that Aristocracy and Toryism have blinded these jurists to truths which are clear to the luminous intellect of a Medary?—*New York Tribune.*

Parties and Politics.

SPEECH

OF

HON. P. P. MURPHY,

OF THE 29th DISTRICT,

ON THE

GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE.

IN SENATE, MARCH 6, 1860.

ALBANY:
WEED, PARSONS & COMPANY, PRINTERS.
1860.

SPEECH

OF

HON. P. P. MURPHY,

OF THE 29th DISTRICT,

ON THE

GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE.

IN SENATE—MARCH 6, 1860.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In rising to address the Senate on this occasion, I shall not affect a diffidence I do not feel; and though I cannot hope to interest or instruct you with the rounded periods of the essayist, like the Hon. Senator from the 1st; the logic and eloquence of the Senator from the 13th, or the poetic inspiration of the Senator from the 9th—yet, I trust, the plain language of a plain man, expressing the convictions of an intelligent and conscientious constituency, will not be considered out of place at this time.

And, at this stage of the discussion, I wish to say, that we accept the sentiments of Gov. Morgan, in his Annual Message, and those of Senator Seward, as given in his several speeches since the organization of the Republican party, "irrepressible conflict" and "higher law" included, as sound expositions of the doctrines of the Republican party, and which commend themselves alike to the head and the heart of every lover of his country, of his race and of free institutions.

Strange it may seem, that Democratic Senators on this floor, have not had even a passing fling at the "higher law." Is it possible that even the "Democracy" are beginning to feel the effects of the great moral and religious sentiment of the free states pressing upon them?

Yes, sir, in my place as a Senator on this floor, and in the name of my constituents, do I thank Mr. Seward for his enunciation of that great and sublime truth.

Let us look for a moment at the time when it was made, and the circumstances by which he was surrounded. Senators were stricken down in the halls of legislation; bowie knives, pistols and clubs were the means used by the so-called Democratic leaders, to intimidate and overcome the friends of freedom. The aristocratic element was controlling the administration, and the "fool who saith in his heart there is no God," was filling the high places of trust and power, whilst the friends of freedom were dispirited and dejected.

A howl of mingled rage, astonishment and anger went up from every Democratic press and every Democratic gathering in the land; from the degraded pot-house politician in the most bestial, subterranean den in New York, to the cabinet minister; it was equally a matter of wonder, that any man dare be so bold as to question the omnipotence of slavery, or to entertain the idea which had become obsolete among Democratic politicians, that the laws of the Great Maker and Ruler of the Universe, were to be obeyed in preference to the laws imposed by the slave power.

This position of Mr. Seward was founded on the rock of eternal truth, and the waves of obscurity, infidelity and slavery, were dashed against it in vain; the intelligent and right thinking rallied to its support, and its assailants retired from the contest abashed and defeated.

Next came the statement by Mr. Seward in his Rochester speech of the "Irrepressible conflict," and was greeted by the democracy with the direst denunciations and misrepresentations. Let us examine it.

From the earliest period of the existence of the human race, until the present time, this conflict has been going on; the conflict of truth against error, right against wrong, freedom against slavery; it is truly irrepressible, and thus it will continue while there is a master on the one side and a slave on the other.

When the poor slave thinks, he becomes con-

scious of the truth that he derives his manhood from the same Almighty Power which created his oppressor, that he is naturally his equal, that he has the same natural right to his own bone and muscle, to his own thews and sinews, to love and protect his wife and children as the aristocrat.

The history of our race on its every page, bears evidence to the truth of this statement. Witness the history of the feudal system in Europe, and its extinguishment gradually and peaceably in some countries, as in England, by the force and determination of the people on the one side, and the giving way of the oppressor on the other, although even then the irrepressible conflict cost a monarch his head, as well as crown.

In France, on the contrary, the oppression was smothered in the blood of the oppressors, and royal family and nobles alike were sent to a gory grave, in the blind rage of an infuriated people. We occasionally hear people exclaim against the horrors of the French revolution. It is not to be wondered at for a moment. The people of France had been imbruted, through centuries of oppression and serfage; and when you systematically deprive a man of the means of progress, when you make it a crime for him to learn to read, or to speak his thoughts, when you seek to make him a mere unreasoning machine, can you be surprised that when he sees his oppressor prostrate before him, he should act like what you sought to make him by the system of serfdom, a wild beast?

In this irrepressible conflict our fathers bore a distinguished part. When they entered the contest for freedom and the rights of man against the mighty power of the British Empire, they proclaimed the great truths, "that all men were created free and equal," and that "governments only derived their just powers from the consent of the governed," and on these issues they staked "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor."

To us, their sons, has this heir-loom descended, the contest against oppression and tyranny. May we be worthy the heritage and equal to the "irrepressible conflict."

The honorable senator from the 13th (Mr. Colvin), declared his adhesion to the doctrines of the Jeffersonian Republican party, and to the present Republican party, its lineal successor, with but one exception. And when I heard him, declare, learned lawyer as he is well known to be, and in the glowing language of his impassioned eloquence, that slavery has no existence in natural law, but is the creature only of positive law, and cannot exist beyond the law which created it, and when he declared his unflinching opposition to its extension into the territories, I recognized my gallant and talented old fellow soldier and colleague of the campaign of '48, and I could not avoid asking myself the sorrowful question, alas! "and did he too go up and acquiesce?"

But, sir, he has become somewhat of a monomaniac on squatter sovereignty, and with him it is a myth, an ideal; his excited imagination has clothed it in all the gorgeous hues of the rainbow, and I cannot doubt his sincerity, when he declared his belief that it was for squatter sovereignty our fathers fought against England in the war of the revolution.

The act may be an ungracious one toward the honorable senator, but I must be permitted to examine the doctrine as reduced to practice, under a democratic administration, and carried out by democratic officials in Kansas and Nebraska; and if it does not appear the same thing in practice that it does in the imaginary description of the senator from the 13th, recollect that with him it is an ideal, while the other is the stern reality of democratic practice.

All the executive, judicial and administrative officers are appointed by the President and are his mere creatures, the *governor* having a veto over the acts of the territorial legislature, without being in any way or manner responsible to the people for his acts.

How was it with the colonies, previous to and at the time of the Revolution? Was not the government precisely the same? Was not the governor, judges, marshals, all the executive, judicial and administrative officers appointed by the royal power; the royal governor possessing also the veto power, and frequently exercising it to arrest the passage of laws by the colonial legislatures, which he apprehended might be distasteful to the sovereign or infringe upon the royal prerogative?

Did not Jefferson, in his first draft of the Declaration of Independence, complain of the royal governors, that they had interposed the veto, when the colonies had passed laws, forbidding the introduction of slaves? And have not the Democratic governors of Kansas and Nebraska also exercised the veto power to annul the passage of laws excluding slaves and slavery from those territories? Can the parallel be more complete; the royal, democratic governors of the present day, following with singular and instinctive fidelity to their aristocratic and federal principles, the examples of their illustrious predecessors in the reign of his majesty George III. Further, whenever a royal governor failed in his duty to the crown, in not repressing the exhibitions of popular sentiment and feeling, he was removed for his disloyalty.

The long line of Democratic governors, whose carcasses cumber the plains of Kansas, when for a moment they hesitated in their fidelity to the aristocracy; or if a suspicion was excited that they were deficient in those cardinal virtues of a servitor of despotism, passive obedience and non-resistance, they were brought to the block, and no plea of former services rendered to the slave power availed them, or stopped for a moment the descent of the fatal axe.

Is more needed to complete the parallel of squatter sovereignty to the government of the colonies; history furnishes it to our hands, in the disturbed state of the country previous to and at the time of the Revolution, the armed force kept here to prevent the gatherings of the people, and to reduce them to submission. Were not citizens of Boston shot down in the street by a hireling soldiery, and yesterday, sir, the 5th of March, was the anniversary of the bloody deed, long held in remembrance by the people of that city? And did not the tory papers of that day ridicule and traduce the shriekers for freedom in the colonies, and denounce them as rebels and traitors? And have we not had the same scenes re-enacted in Kansas? Was not that territory invaded by hordes of armed Mis-

sourians, all "sound on the goose," in the interest of slavery, and headed by that eminent Democrat, drunken Dave Atchison, ex-president, pro tem, of that august body, the Senate of the United States? Was not Lawrence sacked and pillaged; citizens of the territory shot down in cold blood and left weltering on her plains? Did not Democratic politicians, and Democratic papers applaud the acts and denounce every man who ventured to remonstrate, as shriekers for freedom and sympathisers with the rebels and traitors of Kansas, as they were called by the aristocrats and slaveholders in possession of the general government. And as our fathers rebelled against the colonial governments, and the tyranny of royal governors, and drove out their invaders, so did our brethern in Kansas rebel against Democratic squatter sovereignty, when reduced to practice, and drive out the Missouri invaders, who sought to fasten slavery upon her.

After the revolutionary war, the first we heard of squatter sovereignty was from St. Clair, the federal governor of the Northwestern territory, appointed by the elder Adams. St. Clair enunciated the doctrine in an address to the territorial legislature in 1803, for the doing of which he was removed from office by Jefferson, the then President.

It next was exhumed and brought to light by General Cass, in his Nicholson letter of 1847, a fitting resurrectionist of the old federal doctrine; for his laudation of Louis Phillipe and the crowned heads and courts of Europe, proved his adaptation to the task.

In 1856, the convention at Cincinnati adopted it, declaring it a democratic dogma, and that a belief in it is necessary to political salvation, and also affirmed that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the enactment of the Kansas and Nebraska territorial law, were founded on this principle.

The federalists, aristocrats and slaveholders, continued in its support so long as they supposed it would be to their interest, and when it no longer served their turn, they cast it aside in their democratic senatorial caucus, and advanced to the position that both Congress and the territorial legislature cannot legislate against Slavery in the territories, but are obliged, when necessary, to legislate for its protection.

The Little Giant could not remain long behind. So, on Wednesday last he made his last great bid for the Charleston nomination, by making the shameless admission that squatter sovereignty was a snare and a delusion from the beginning; and that he all the while intended Slavery should go into the territories. The following is his language: "But inasmuch as the power to introduce Slavery, notwithstanding the Mexican laws, was conferred on the territorial legislatures under the compromise measures of 1850, the right to introduce it into Kansas, notwithstanding the Missouri restriction, was also proposed to be conferred, without expressly repealing the restriction. The legal effect was precisely the same."

Now, gentlemen, *we* are ready for the contest. We challenge you to the combat, with Stephen A. Douglas, squatter sovereignty, old federalism, extension of Slavery and niggers for the niggerless on the one side; and on the other, Wm. H. Seward, the principles of Jefferson and the Fathers, in the government of the territories, the restriction of Slavery, land for the landless, and the protection of the rights of labor against capital.

Such are the platforms upon which the respective parties go before the people. On these the political battle is to be fought, and may God defend the right.

At the close of the revolutionary struggle, the country was exhausted by the long continuance of the war, the destruction of commerce and the diversion of industry from all its accustomed pursuits, in addition, a new form of government had to be instituted; for the old articles of confederation were found to be a failure, a mere rope of sand which could not bind the country together.

There were men who had lent all their energies to the contest in separating this country from England, yet they had been so moulded by education and habit to a conformity with existing forms of government, that they dared not think of any other; they had no confidence in the capacity of the people for self-government, and were desirous of establishing a limited monarchy, or as near it as they could arrive. At the head of this class stood Alexander Hamilton, a man of rare endowments and of undoubted patriotism, but who distrusted the people.

On the other side were those who desired to make the people sovereign, who had confidence in them, in their honesty, integrity and capacity; and who so fit to lead this body of men, as he who gave to the world the immortal truths embodied in the Declaration of Independence. Thus Hamilton became the representative of the one set of ideas, and Jefferson of the other.

These were the warring elements in the Convention that framed the Constitution of the United States, and as neither party fully triumphed, the Constitution as framed and submitted to the States for adoption, was a partial compromise.

When the new government was organized under the Constitution and put in operation, these conflicting ideas sought to give each its own construction to the Constitution, and impress its own character upon the organization of the general government.

The Federalists, under the lead of Hamilton and Adams, were desirous of centralizing all power, and limiting and weakening the several state governments, insisting that all power not denied by the Constitution to the United States, belonged of right to the general government, and should be exercised by it.

The contrary opinion was entertained by Jefferson, Madison and the Republican party, who succeeded in adding to the Constitution amendments, embodying their views, as follows, viz.:

Article 9. "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Article 10. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively or to the people."

The passage of the alien and sedition laws, during the administration of the elder Adams, assisted in driving the Federal party from power, and the commencement of the present century saw the Republican party take the place of its opponents in the government of the country.

During all this contest, no voice was raised in favor of slavery; our fathers, fresh from the battle fields of the Revolution, whatever their peculiar views in regard to the form of government, chattel slavery was alike abhorrent to all.

The language of the preamble to that glorious compact, is characteristic of their devotion to the doctrine of personal liberty, and is in the following words, viz.:

"We, the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of *liberty* to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The ordinance of 1787, re-enacted in 1789 by the first Congress, which assembled under the Constitution, and by which slavery was excluded from all the then territory of the United States, proves conclusively that chattel slavery was regarded as alike in opposition to the laws of God, and those principles upon which, in the face of the world, they had rested their defense in throwing off their allegiance to the mother country.

The leading ideas of Republican statesmen were circumscribing slavery and extending freedom, to preserve the territories of the United States as a sacred inheritance for freemen forever, both of native and foreign birth, and to keep them unpolluted by the footstep of the slave, the clanking of his manacles or the crack of the driver's whip.

This was the settled policy of the Republican party, and continued as long as the party existed under that distinctive name.

In 1811, the people of the territory of Indiana, petitioned Congress to be permitted to hold slaves. The petition was referred to a committee, of which the celebrated John Randolph (himself a slaveholder, be it remembered) was chairman, and who reported against the prayer of the petitioners in the most decided language.

In 1803, Louisiana was acquired from France by purchase; slavery existed there at the time, and by virtue of the stipulations of the treaty it continued in existence.

In 1820, after a long struggle, Missouri was admitted as a slave state, but with the distinct stipulation in the 8th section of the act admitting her, that slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, should never exist north of the line of 36° 30′. This formed the celebrated Missouri Compromise, and was claimed by the slaveholders as a victory, having obtained possession of all the settled portion of the territory.

But so strong was the feeling in the free states against this surrender of territory to slavery, that every northern member who voted for it went down under the indignation of his constituents.

Thus it will be seen that the principles of the Jeffersonian Republican party were identical with those now held by the present party bearing that name; the same opposition to the extension of slavery into the territories, the same desire to keep them for the free white man and his family to settle and cultivate, the same respect for the personal rights of man and the same declaration of the rights and duties of Congress in the government of the people's property.

The fears of Jefferson regarding the aristocratic tendencies of the Supreme Court of the United States have become sad realities; holding office by a life tenure, under no responsibility to the people, they arrogate to themselves the right to determine the power and duties of co-ordinate and independent branches of the government, to change the spirit of the Constitution by construction and to decide political questions which only belong to the people to determine.

In 1824 there were five Republican candidates in the field, for the Presidency; the old Federal party having disbanded, the members of it still imbued with the old principles of the party, were scattered loose around among the supporters of the different candidates; the result of that contest, which was decided in the House of Representatives, is well known. In 1828 a re-organization took place under Jackson and the democratic party was the result.

The principles of the old Republican party continued to govern the Democratic until the election of Polk, who in an evil hour succumbed to Calhounism and old federalism, and since then the retrogression of the party has been constant and rapid, with an old Federalist at the head of the government as President, an old federalist as Chief Justice, and nullifiers and disunionists filling all the high posts of government and controling the administration.

The Missouri Compromise was repealed by a Democratic Congress; the bill was introduced by Stephen A. Douglas, without a single petition asking for it even from the South; it was carried through both houses by a Democratic majority and approved by a Democratic President.

Further, the President promised in advance to take care of those members of Congress from the free states, who should vote for it contrary to the wishes of their constituents and suffer a loss in consequence of that vote.

And well did the President fulfill that promise. But few of the recreant members were returned at the next congressional election, and the political bankrupts were quartered by the President on the foreign missions and consulates; thus, proving, beyond the possibility of denial, that the Democratic party systematically rewards representatives who will betray their constituents. Was anything more vile, more demoralizing, more wicked, ever practised in the despotic governments of Europe? When the news came north, the softs fretted and fumed, talked loudly about their opposition to the extension of slavery, and their devotion to freedom; but when they took the "sober second thought," and recollected that slavery had the disposal of the offices, their anger cooled down, they took the back track, went up to Syracuse and acquiesced. The hards brazened it out; they deserve respect for being consistent even in the wrong.

Although they have thrown away all of the principles of Old Hickory, yet they retain some share of his outspoken frankness. And when they have made up their mind to serve the devil (which they often do), they will describe him at full length, horns, cloven foot, tail and all, while the softs, under the same circumstances, yes, even in the act of acquiescing, will swear you that the object of their devotion is an

angel of light. Such men do "steal the livery of the court of Heaven to serve the devil in.

There arose at nearly the same time, two stars of the first magnitude, above the political horizon of this state, I refer to Silas Wright and William H. Seward. Each pointed the way in his own party, and as Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt, so these great leaders guided the true Democracy, each of his own party, towards the haven of Republicanism.

The ethics of each were those of Jefferson and the Republican fathers, and each was equally opposed to aristocracy, federalism and the aggressions of the slave power; and the teachings of each, followed to their legitimate sequence, has brought into existence the Republican party. Each deemed humanity worth far more, for development and preservation, than for consumption and destruction. With both Wright and Seward man was deemed of far more worth than gold, and so each came in conflict with the monarchists and federalists of his party.

Notwithstanding, the nomination of Wright alone saved the State of New York, and the election of Polk to the Democracy, yet for his known and avowed Republican principles, he was doomed to destruction, by the aristocrats, nullifiers and slaveholders now in possession of the general government, the decree was sent forth and their servile tools were instructed to to ensure his defeat, and this was accomplished in the name of Democracy. "Oh! Democracy. What crimes are perpetrated in thy name!"

The star of Silas Wright set early, but unobscured by the mists and fogs of modern Democracy.

Mr. Seward was doomed to an almost similar ordeal. After the death of Clay and Webster, he was left the leader of his party, and as he was the known and acknowledged representative of the true Democratic and free labor element in that party, the same means were employed to compass his destruction as was successful in the case of Wright. The administration of the general government was also employed, directing, aiding, counseling and rewarding the assassins; and this, too, by that administration which inflicted the Fugitive Slave Law upon an insulted country; which employed the army and navy of the United States in hunting and returning poor fugitives from slavery, and which surrounded with chains the court house in Boston to accomplish the same unhallowed purpose.

The causes and acts described culminated in the formation of the Republican party.

The friends of Silas Wright, in the Democratic party, determined upon active, open opposition to the aristocracy and the slave power, and with the assistance of many Whigs holding the same opinions, assembled at Buffalo, in 1848, and inaugurated the movement, by the nomination of Martin Van Buren, and the adoption of the Buffalo platform. This action produced the defeat of Cass, and the election of Taylor, in the memorable conflict of that year. The death of Taylor took place soon after his entering upon the duties of office, and was followed by the administration of Fillmore, which completed the demoralization of the Whig party.

A portion of the Democratic free-soilers of '48, under the blandishments of Prince John, and the allurements of the flesh pots of the treasury, again went back to the latter-day Democracy. The intestine divisions, the quarrelling in the primary meetings, the broken heads in Tammany and the bludgeoning in state conventions, shows the old quarrel still open and going on as rampant as ever; and thus will it continue, for be assured, old Federalism and the slave power, now governing the party, will never forgive you, that you dared entertain independent opinions, and say that Jefferson and the fathers taught otherwise than the modern Democracy. Aye humble yourselves in the dust, crawl on your bellies and eat dirt all the rest of your lives, and yet you will not be forgiven.—The slave power is implacable, inexorable; the fate of John A. Dix is held up in terrorem over your heads.

Well may it be written over the portals of modern Democracy, as it was over the entrance of a certain other place, "Who enters here leaves hope behind."

In 1852, the Whig and Democratic parties entered upon the contest of that year, standing upon the same platform; and, as might have been expected, the Whigs were defeated. The large capitalists and the slaveholders calculating rightly, that the latter-day Democracy were more reliable, more devoted to their interests; and that the leaders of the Democracy in the northern states were as reckless in their pursuit of treasury pap and official place, as the Dutch skipper was in the pursuit of trade, when he declared, that "if he could make six pence by passing through hell, he would run the risk of scorching his sails."

This defeat crushed out the Whig party and resolved it into its primitive elements. That portion of it which held the views of Mr. Seward, who had ever stood steadily by him in his defense of freedom and the rights of man, in short the republican and true democratic portion of the Whig party, joined the old free-soilers and radical democrats who were driven out of their party by the aggressions of Pierce, his open devotion to slavery in all its requirements and the insulting letter of his secretary, Cushing, that he intended to crush out free-soilism in the northern States.

These united in the formation of the republican party, congenial elements seeking their political affinities.

Mr. Chairman, it was my good fortune to be present and to assist in the formation of this great and glorious party. It was a sight ennobling to our common humanity to see men who had been warring against each other in hostile and conflicting political organizations for a lifetime coming together and yielding up their prejudices; being satisfied that they had the same principles, the same love of freedom and the same hatred of oppression in common.

But the crowning act was when the Whig convention, which was in session at the same time, came into the room where the free-soil democratic convention was held, and there both parties, in a spirit of true devotion to freedom, offered up on the altar of their common country their party name and their party organization; there never has been such a scene enacted in our country since the time when our revolutionary fathers assembled and pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor in the cause of freedom.

It was no common act of abnegation on the part of the Whig convention. They were the representatives of a great party, which had had its presidents and which even then held the political power of this great State in its hands; it had its battle-fields, its victories, and its cherished party name to think of. But patriotism and true devotion to country demanded the sacrifice; they never hesitated: they were equal to the high mission. All honor to them for the act.

Well was it said at the time, "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

This great party thus formed has gone on conquering and to conquer, collecting within its ranks the intelligent, the honest, the fearless, the lover of freedom and of his race.

Not only the "native to the manor born," but the man of foreign lineage who loves freedom and hates slavery here finds his appropriate place.

But, sir, it may be asked what has become of the remainder of those who constituted the Whig party; I answer they have gone to their appointed place. It is a law governing the whole world that like not only begets like, but where there is freedom of motion allowed like also consorts with like. This is not only true of animate but also of inanimate nature.

Thus you will find a portion of those who were Whigs, with the latter-day Democracy, and they may generally be known by their boisterous professions of devotion and extreme subserviency to the slave power, and unmeasured abuse of Republicans and Republican principles. Witness the attack of Choate on the Declaration of Independence.

Another portion animated by the most vindictive personal hatred of Mr. Seward, originated the order of the dark lantern for his certain destruction; the fate of that renowned and mushroom like association has become a historical fact. At the last gathering at Binghamton they not equal in numbers the followers of John Brown in his mad raid on Harper's Ferry.

The star of William H. Seward is in the ascendant and he is the representative man of his party; around him cluster the brave and the free, the men of strong arms and stout hearts, and they will not consent that his claims shall be postponed in favor of one whose pulses do not throb in unison with the great heart of freedom beating in the bosom of the Republican party.

I have thus endeavored to show the position of the two great parties of the country on the political questions of the time, with "nothing extenuate nor aught set down in malice."

The moral and social aspects of the question and the deteriorating effects of slavery on the dominant race, and the blight of all progressive tendencies and of all industrial pursuits in that country where it prevails, have been most truthfully and eloquently shown by the Hon. Senator from the 27th.

As to the poetry furnished for the Democracy on this occasion by the Senator from the 9th, I can only say that it is worthy of the spirit inspiring it.

Can any man suppose that the sublime thoughts and noble language of Bryant, Whittier and other true poets when they sang the charms of nature, the God given rights of man, the eventual and sure success of virtue and freedom, could ever have been inspired by the spirit of slavery which pervades and actuates the latter day Democracy; no, had slavery been the theme they would have sang in doggrel verse like the Senator from the 9th.

Bryant never could have given utterance to that noble thought, in language so befitting the sentiment:

"Truth crushed to earth, will rise again,
The eternal years of God are her's;
But error wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshipers."

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS, NO. 7.

REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ABRAHAM LINCOLN,

OF ILLINOIS,

AT THE

REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION, HELD AT SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS, JUNE 16, 1858.

If we could first know *where* we are, and *whither* we are tending, we could then better judge *what* to do, and *how* to do it.

We are now far into the *fifth* year, since a policy was initiated, with the *avowed* object and *confident* promise of putting an end to Slavery agitation.

Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only *not ceased*, but has *constantly augmented*.

In *my* opinion, it *will* not cease, until a *crisis* shall have been reached and passed. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe this government cannot endure permanently half *slave* and half *free*. I do not expect the Union to be *dissolved*. I don't expect it will cease to be divided. It will become *all* one thing, or *all* the other. Either the *opponents* of Slavery will arrest the future spread of it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction; or its *advocates* will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in *all* the states, *old* as well as *new*—*North* as well as *South*. Have we no *tendency* to the latter condition?

Let any one who doubts, carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination—piece of *machinery* so to speak—compounded of the Nebraska doctrine, and the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider not only *what work* the machinery is adopted to do, and *how well* adopted; but also, let him study the *history* of its construction, and trace, if he can, or rather *fail*, if he can, to trace the evidences of design, and concert of action, among its chief bosses, from the beginning. But, so far, *Congress* only, had acted; and an *indorsement* by the people, *real* or *apparent*, was indispensable, to *save* the point already gained, and give chance for more. The new year of 1854 found Slavery excluded from more than half the states by state constitutions, and from most of the national territory by congressional prohibition. Four days later commenced the struggle, which ended in repealing that congressional prohibition.

This opened all the national territory to Slavery, and was the first point gained. This necessity had not been overlooked; but had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of "*squatter sovereignty*," otherwise called "*sacred right of self-government*," which latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it, as to amount to just this: That if any *one* man choose to enslave *another*, no *third* man shall be allowed to object. That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska bill itself, in the language which follows: "*It being the true intent and meaning of this act, not to legislate Slavery into any territory or state, nor exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.*" Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favor of "squatter sovereignty," and "sacred right of self-government."

"But," said Opposition members, "let us be more *specific*—let us *amend* the bill so as to expressly declare that the people of the territory *may* exclude Slavery." "Not we," said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment. While the Nebraska bill was passing through Congress, a *law case*, involving the question of a negro's freedom, by reason of his owner having, voluntarily, taken him, first, into a free state, and then a territory, covered by the congressional prohibition, and held him as a slave, for a long time in each, was passing through the United States circuit court for the district of Missouri; and both Nebraska bill and law suit were brought to a decision in the same month of May, 1854. The negro's name was "Dred Scott," which name now designates the decision finally made in the case.

Before the *then* next presidential election, the law case came to, and was argued in the Supreme Court of the United States; but the *decision* of it was deferred until after the election. Still, before the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requests the leading advocate of the Nebraska bill to state *his opinion*, whether the people of a territory can constitutionally exclude Slavery from their limits, and the latter answers: "That is a question for the supreme court." The election came; Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the *indorsement*, such as it was, secured. That was the *second* point gained. The indorsement, however, fell short of a clear, popular majority, by nearly four hundred thousand votes, and so, perhaps, was not overwhelmingly reliable and satisfactory. The *outgoing* President, in his last annual message, as impressively as possible *echoed back* upon the people the weight and authority of the indorsement.

The Supreme Court met again; they *did not* announce their decision, but ordered a re-argument. The presidential inauguration came, and still no decision of the court; but the *incoming* President, in his inaugural address, fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming decision, *whatever it might be*. Then in a few days came the decision. The reputed author of the Nebraska bill, finds an early occasion to make a speech at this Capitol, indorsing the Dred Scott decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to it. The new President, too, seizes the early occasion of the Stillman letter to *indorse* and strongly *construe* that decision, and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained.

At length a squabble springs up between the president and the author of the Nebraska bill, on the *mere* question of fact, whether the Lecompton Constitution was or was not in any just sense made by the people of

Kansas; and in that squabble, the latter declares that all he wants is a fair vote from the people, and that he *cares* not whether Slavery be voted *down* or voted *up*. I do not understand this declaration, that he cares not whether Slavery be voted down or voted up, to be intended by him other than as an *apt definition* of the *policy* he would impress upon the public mind—the *principle* for which he declares he has suffered much, and is ready to suffer to the end. And well may he cling to that principle. If he has any parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine. Under the Dred Scott decision "squatter sovereignty," squatted out of existence—tumbled down like temporary scaffolding; like the mold at the foundry, served through one blast and fell back into loose sand—helped to carry an election, and then was kicked to the winds. His late *joint* struggle with the Republicans, against the Lecompton Constitution, involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point—the right of the people to make their own constitution—upon which he and the Republicans have never differed.

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas's "care not" policy, constitute the piece of machinery in its *present* state of advancement. The *working* points of that machinery are: First, that no negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave, can ever be a citizen of any state, in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States. This point is made in order to deprive the negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of this provision of the United States Constitution, which declares "That the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states."

Secondly, that "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither *Congress* nor a *territorial legislature* can exclude Slavery from the United States territory. This point is made in order that individual men may *fill up* the territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property, and thus to enhance the chances of *permanency* to the institution through all the future.

Thirdly, that whether the holding a negro in actual Slavery, in a free state, makes him free, as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave state the negro may be forced into by the master.

This point is made, not to be pressed *immediately;* but, if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently *indorsed* by the people at an election, *then* to sustain the logical conclusion, that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott in the free state of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with other *one*, or one *thousand* slaves, in Illinois, or in any other free state. Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to *educate* and *mold* public opinion, at least *Northern* public opinion, not to *care* whether Slavery is voted *down* or *up*. This shows exactly where we now *are*, and *partially*, also, whither we are tending.

It will throw additional light on the latter, to go back and run the mind over the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will *now* appear less *dark* and *mysterious* than they did *when* they were transpiring. The people were to believe "perfectly freely," "subject only to the Constitution." What the *Constitution* had to do with it, outsiders could not

then see. Plainly enough *now*, it was an exactly fitted *niche* for the Dred Scott decision to afterward come in, and declare that *perfect freedom* of the people to be just no freedom at all. Why was the amendment, expressly declaring the right of the people to exclude Slavery, voted down? Plainly enough *now*, an adoption of it would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision. Why was the court decision held up? Why even a senator's individual opinion withheld till *after* the presidential election? Plainly enough *now*, the speaking out *then* would have endangered the "*perfectly free*" argument upon which the question was to be carried. Why the *outgoing* President's felicitation on the indorsement? Why the delay of a re-argument? Why the incoming President's *advance* exhortation in favor of the decision? These things *look* like the cautious *patting* and *petting* of a spirited horse, preparatory to mounting him, when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall. And why the hasty after indorsements of the decision by the President and others? We cannot absolutely *know* that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places, and by different workmen—Stephen, Franklin, Roger and James, for instance—and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few—not omitting even scaffolding—or, if a single piece be lacking, we can see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared to yet bring this piece in—in *such* a case we find it impossible to not *believe* that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common *plan* or *draft* drawn up before the first lick was struck.

It should not be overlooked that, by the Nebraska bill, the people of a *state* as well as *territory*, were to be left "*perfectly*" *free*, "*subject only to the Constitution.*" Why mention a *state?* They were legislating for *territories*, and not *for* or *about states*. Certainly the people of a *state are* and *ought to be* subject to the Constitution of the United States; but why is mention of this *lugged* into this merely *territorial* law? Why are the people of a *territory* and the people of a *state* therein *lumped* together, and their relation to the Constitution therein treated as being *precisely* the same? While the opinion of *the court*, by Chief Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case, and the separate opinions of the concurring judges, expressly declare that the Constitution of the United States neither permits Congress nor a territorial legislature to exclude Slavery from any United States territory, they all *omit* to declare whether or not the same Constitution permits a *state*, or the people of a state, to exclude it.

Possibly, this was a mere *omission;* but who can be *quite* sure, if McLean or Curtis had sought to get into the opinion a declaration of unlimited power in the people of a *state* to exclude Slavery from their limits, just as Chase and Mace sought to get such declaration in behalf of the people of a territory, into the Nebraska bill—I ask who can be quite *sure* that it would not have been voted down in one case as it had been in the other. The nearest approach to the point of declaring the power of a state over Slavery is made by Judge Nelson. He approaches it more than once, using the precise idea and *almost* the language too of the Nebraska act. On one occasion his exact language is, "Except in cases where the power is

restrained by the Constitution of the United States, the law of the state is supreme over the subject of Slavery within its jurisdiction."

In what *cases* the power of the *states* is so restrained by the United States Constitution, is left an *open* question, precisely as the same question as to the restraint on the power of the *territories* was left open in the Nebraska act. Put *that* and *that* together, and we have another nice little niche, which we may, ere long, see filled with another Supreme Court decision, declaring that the Constitution of the United States does not permit a *state* to exclude Slavery from its limits. And this may especially be expected if the doctrine of "care not whether Slavery be voted *down* or voted *up*," shall gain upon the public mind sufficiently to give promise that such a decision can be maintained when made. Such a decision is all that Slavery now lacks of being alike lawful in all the states. Welcome, or unwelcome, such a decision *is* probably coming, and will soon be upon us, unless the power of the present political dynasty shall be met and overthrown. We shall *lie down* pleasantly dreaming that the people of *Missouri* are on the verge of making their state *free;* and we shall *awake* to the *reality*, instead, that the *Supreme* Court has made *Illinois* a *slave* state.

To meet and overthrow the power of that dynasty is thework now before all those who would prevent that consummation. That is *what* we have to do. But how can we best do it.

There are those who denounce us *openly* to their own friends, and yet whisper *us softly* that Senator Douglas is the *aptest* instrument there is, with which to effect that object. They do not tell us, nor has he told us, that he *wishes* any such object to be effected. They wish us to *infer* all, from the facts, that he now has a little quarrel with the head of the present dynasty; and that he has regularly voted with us, on a single point, upon which he and we have never differed. They remind us that *he* is a very *great man*, and that the largest of *us* are very small ones. Let this be granted. But "a *living dog* is better than a *dead lion*." Judge Douglas, if not a *dead* lion *for this work*, is at least a *caged* and *toothless* one. How can he oppose the advance of Slavery? He don't *care* any thing about it. His avowed *mission is impressing* the "public heart" to *care nothing about it.*

A leading Douglas Democratic newspaper thinks Douglas's superior talent will be needed to resist the revival of the African slave-trade. Does Douglas believe an effort to revive that trade is approaching? He has not said so. Does he really think so? But if it is how can he resist it? For years he has labored to prove it a *sacred right* of white men to take negro slaves into the new territories. Can he possibly show that it is less a sacred right to buy them where they can be bought cheapest? And unquestionably they can be bought *cheaper* in *Africa* than in *Virginia*. He has done all in his power to reduce the whole question of slavery to one of a mere *right of property;* and as such, how can he oppose the foreign slave-trade—how can he refuse that "property" shall be "perfectly free" unless he does it as a *protection* to the home production? And as the home *producers* will probably not ask the protection he will be wholly without a ground of opposition.

Senator Douglas holds, we know, that a man may rightfully be *wiser to-day* than he was *yesterday*, that he may rightfully change when he finds himself wrong. But, can we for that reason run ahead and *infer* that he *will* make any particular change, of which he himself has given no intimation? Can we *safely* base *our* action upon any such vague inference? Now, as ever,

I wish to not *misrepresent* Judge Douglas's *position*, question his *motives*, or do aught that can be personally offensive to him. Whenever, *if ever*, he and we can come together on *principle*, so that our great cause may have assistance from *his great ability*, I hoped to have interposed no adventitious obstacle. But clearly he is not *now* with us—he does not pretend to be—he does not *promise* to *ever* be. Our cause, then, must be intrusted to and conducted by its own undoubted friends—those whose hands are free, whose hearts are in the work, who *do care* for the result.

Two years ago, the Republicans of the nation mustered over thirteen hundred thousand strong. We did this under the single impulse of resistance to a common danger, and with every external circumstance against us. Of *strange*, *discordant*, and even *hostile* elements, we gathered from the four winds and *formed* and fought the battle through, under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud and pampered enemy. Did we brave all *then* to *falter* now?—*now*—when that same enemy is *wavering*, dissevered and belligerent? The result is not doubtful. We shall not fail; if we stand firm, we shall not fail. *Wise councils* may *accelerate* or *mistakes delay* it, but, sooner or later, the victory is *sure* to come.

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS, NO. 8.

REPUBLICAN NOMINATIONS.

SPEECH

OF

CARL SCHURZ,

AT THE

MILWAUKEE RATIFICATION MEETING,

ON WEDNESDAY EVENING, MAY 30, 1860.

Mr. President and Gentlemen:

As one of the delegates who had the honor to represent the Republicans of Wisconsin in the National Convention, I feel called upon to give you a brief account of our doings and of the views which guided us in our course. We have faithfully endeavored to do our duty, as we understood it, and I am bold enough to assume that our understanding of it did not differ from yours.

We went there not only for the purpose of subserving the interests of the party, but above all of promoting the interests of our *cause*.

The question to be solved at Chicago, as we understood it, was not only how we could beat the Democracy, but whether a defeat of the Democracy would be a victory of Republicanism. We do not forget that there are triumphs which are no victories, and that such triumphs, dangerous and treacherous as they always will be, may become even worse than defeats; for, being the triumphs of politicians instead of the cause, they will loosen the moral bonds which hold a party together, and substitute in their place the mere cohesive power of public plunder.

We are well aware, that for some time previous to the meeting of the National Convention, in some Republican newspapers, in speeches and private circulars, an extreme tenderness was shown for the prejudices and susceptibilities of those, who had never acted with us, while much less regard was paid to the feelings and preferences of the Republican masses. We expected to see this policy urged upon the National Convention, and we were determined to present to it a bold and unflinching opposition. For, we thought we appreciated the true element of our strength. We knew that mere drill and discipline, and party dictation would never drive the Republican masses into silent obedience to the mandates of that convention, if those mandates run contrary to the popular conscience. We kept in mind that the Republican party had sprung from the indignation of the people

aroused by a flagrant breach of trust, and had gained its strength by the uprising of the popular heart for great positive ideas; that it is a party of volunteers held together not by drill and command, but by the moral power of a great common cause, that by joining the Republican organization, not one of us gave up his moral and political independence; that we did not deed away our conscience in inscribing our names upon its roll; that its claims on our support depend on the hold it has on our convictions; that its tenure is on good behavior, and that it cannot and shall not be ruled by the wily arms of secret diplomacy.

I have heard it said that in consequence of all this, the Republican party is a very difficult party to be managed—but nothing in the world can be easier, as long as the simple but great truth is kept in view, that the masses will remain true to the Republican party, as long as the Republican party remains true to itself. It was our conviction, that if the Convention had fallen into the fatal error of attempting to change the faith and policy of the party, as we would change our dress, it would quickly have found out that the Republican party is essentially the party of independent men, that its power rests upon public opinion, and that it can do no wrong with impunity.

With these ideas uppermost in our minds, we went into that Convention, determined to preserve in its purity the original idea upon which the party was founded; determined never to sell out the moral character and the great future of the Republican cause for the treacherous glitter of plausible combinations, brought about by trade and compromise, determined rather to risk a defeat than to lose our own identity in the chase after a delusive phantom of party success; in one word, determined to have a Republican platform, and upon it a Republican candidate. I leave it to the people of Wisconsin to decide whether they were misrepresented by their delegates.

By the partiality of our delegation, I was placed upon the committee on platforms and resolutions. The spirit which animated that committee was that the standard of Republicanism should not be lowered one single inch. We endeavored to lift the creed of the party far above the level of mere oppositional policy. The platform gives it a positive character. The Republicans stand before the country, not only as the Anti-slavery party, but emphatically as the party of free labor. While penning up slave labor within the limits which the legislation of sovereign states has assigned to it, we propose to plant free labor in the territories by the Homestead bill, and to promote free labor all over the land by the encouragement of home industry. In throwing its shield over the eternal principles of human rights, the platform presents the Anti-slavery policy of the party in its logical connection with the great material interests of the country. "To man, his birthright; to labor, freedom; to him that wants to labor, work and in independence; to him that works, his dues." This is the Republican platform.

It affords me special satisfaction to state, that the resolutions, the passage of which was recommended by the Republican State Convention of Wisconsin—I mean those concerning the Homestead bill, and the rights of naturalized citizens, were successfully advocated, and form part of our national creed.

Our platform, adopted without opposition and almost without discussion, adopted amidst the most spontaneous and sublime outbursts of enthusiasm human eye ever witnessed, is before the people. It is the boldest, plainest, the most liberal ever presented to the nation by a political party, and the

enthusiastic shouts of millions from Maine to the Rocky Mountains, have already sanctioned it with their approval.

Mr. President, the delegates of this state were instructed to cast their votes for the nomination of William H. Seward. It was certainly not for reasons of availability that Mr. Seward's name was brought forward. But we were accustomed to look up to him as the intellectual head of the political anti-Slavery movement. From him we received the battle-cry in the turmoils of the contest; for he was one of those bold spirits who sometimes will go ahead of public opinion, instead of tamely following its footprints. He would compress into a single sentence—a single word—the whole issue of a controversy; and those words became the inscriptions on our banners, the pass-words of our combatants. His comprehensive intellect possesses the peculiar power of penetrating into the interior connection, and grasping the general tendency of events and ideas, things and abstractions; he charms our minds with panoramic views of our political and social condition, and the problems to be solved; his telescopic eye seems to pierce even the veil which covers future developments; and while all his acts and words are marked by a thorough-going and uncompromising consistency, they are at the same time adorned with the peculiar graces of superior mental culture.

The same qualities which made him the object of the fiercest and most acrimonious hostility on the part of our opponents, could not fail to assign to him, in the hearts of his friends, a place which hardly another man in the nation could fill. But a popularity like this, is not apt to become general. He was one of the earliest champions of our cause. He fought for it, sometimes single-handed and alone, standing firm and unmoved in the storm of fanaticism and vituperation. He fought for it when he was unpopular, and all the prejudice that existed against his principles, all the odium that was cast upon his doctrine, centered upon his person. He was the bugbear with which political children were frightened, and a great many were accustomed to couple with the name of Seward all that was detestable and dangerous. His principles emerged from that cloud of prejudice, but his name did not, and although a daily increasing number of friends gathered around him, yet a great many could not divest themselves of their early impressions.

And so this became one of the instances, which you so frequently meet with in the history of mankind, that individuals have to pay a tribute of self-denial to their own greatness. The success of the cause they serve is apt to bring with it the disappointment of their personal aspirations. This is a melancholy fate, but it is no less glorious and sublime, for even the highest positive merit may receive a still higher lustre from the divine appointment of self-sacrifice. History does not judge men by the outward emblems of power and preferment. The greatest names are those who need no title in order to be great. Seward has lost nothing in the Convention. He is to-day what he was yesterday. He can hardly stand higher; he certainly does not stand lower.

We, the delegates from Wisconsin, voted for him to the last. I may say that a few hours after my arrival at Chicago I saw that Seward's nomination was very improbable. I do not lay claim to any particular sagacity and foresight for that, for it was a plain arithmetical problem. The causes which brought about his defeat I will not detail; suffice it to say, that they were not of a futile nature. But we stood by him, determined to carry his

name as high as possible. Nor did we follow the example of those who changed their votes after the decisive ballot, before the final result was announced; not as though we had been opposed to Mr. Lincoln, than whom there is no truer man in the nation, but because we thought we owed it to our old chieftain, that, if fail we must, he should withdraw with the honors of war, surrounded by an unbroken column of true and devoted friends. So New York, Wisconsin, Michigan and some delegates from other States, stood together to the last. Thus was this debt of honor discharged; we considered it honestly due, and it was honestly paid.

I need hardly, say, sir, that when the motion was made to make Mr. Lincoln's nomination unanimous, we seconded it without any sacrifice of feeling, and when it was carried, we heartily joined in the general enthusiasm. We had not gone there, to have our candidate nominated or none; but with the royal intention to subordinate our individual judgment to the judgment of the majority, provided the convention asked of us nothing inconsistent with our consciences as anti-Slavery men, and the dignity of the Republican cause. And I do not hesitate to say, that if Gov. Seward had not been in the field, Mr. Lincoln would, unless I mistake the temper of our people, in all probability, have been the first choice of Wisconsin. Although Gov. Seward failed, Mr. Lincoln's nomination nailed the good old Republican banner to the mast as boldly and definantly as ever.

Mr. President, I had the honor to be a member of that committee who were to carry to Mr. Lincoln the official announcement of his nomination. The enthusiasm with which we were received at Springfield was boundless. There we saw Mr. Lincoln's neighbors, and it became at once apparent that those who knew him best, loved and esteemed him most. And then I saw Mr. Lincoln again, for I had met him before in that memorable senatorial campaign in Illinois, when he, as a man of true and profound convictions, although discountenanced and discouraged by many leading Republicans, who thought it good policy to let Mr. Douglas return to the Senate without opposition, threw himself forward for the imperiled purity of our principles, grasped with a bold hand the Republican banner, which was in danger of sinking into the mire of compromise and unnatural combinations, and held it up proudly aloft in one of the fiercest struggles the country ever witnessed. I met him then, in the thick of the fight, when he bearded the lion of demagogism in his den, when the brilliant sallies of his wit and sarcasm drew shouts of delight from the multitude, when the thunderbolts of his invective rattled triumphantly against the brazen front of Stephen A. Douglas, when the lucid, unanswerable logic of his arguments inspired every patriotic heart with new confidence in the justice of our cause, and when under his powerful blows the large Democratic majority of Illinois dwindled down to nothing. There I saw him do what perhaps no other man in the nation would have done. There I learned to confide in the patriot and the defender of profound convictions, to esteem the statesman and to love the man.

And, now, I saw him again, surrounded by the committee of the national convention who had come to lay in his hands the highest honor and the greatest trust which a political party has to bestow—an honor which he had not thought of in his hard fought battles, which he had not craved and had hardly been sanguine enough to expect. There he stood silently listening to the address of our chairman; his eyes downcast; in his soul, perhaps, a feeling of just pride struggling with the overawing consciousness of respon-

sibility. Then he answered, thanking them for the honors bestowed upon him and accepting the leadership in the great struggle, not with the exulting tone of one who has achieved a personal triumph; not with the pompous airs and artificial dignity of one who is conscious of standing upon the great stage of the world, but with that unaffected modest simplicity of a man who is strong in the consciousness of his ability and his honest intention to do right.

Many of those who now surrounded him had voted for other candidates in the convention, and some, still laboring under a feeling of personal disappointment, had come there not without some prejudice unfavorable to Mr. Lincoln. But when they saw a man who had worked his way from the humblest station in life to his present eminence, not by fast speculations or adventurous efforts, not on the wing of good luck, but by quiet, steady labor, unswerving fidelity to principle and his private and public duties, by the vigor of his genius and the energy of his character—the man who had won the confidence of the people and was now lifted upon the shield of a great national party, not by ingenious combinations and adroit management, but by the popular instinct—unfettered by promises, unpledged to anybody and anything but the people and the welfare of our country, his hands free to carry out the honest dictates of his pure conscience, a life behind him, not only above reproach, but above suspicion, a problem before him, for the solution of which he was eminently fitted by the native virtues of his character, the high abilities of his mind, and a strong honest purpose, then they all felt, with this pure and patriotic statesman, all those great qualities would return to the white house, which makes republican government what it ought to be—a government founded upon virtue. And an Eastern delegate, who had voted against him in the convention, whispered to me in a tone of the highest satisfaction: "Sir, we might have done a more daring thing, but we certainly could not have done a better thing."

I cannot find words strong enough to designate the silliness of those who sneeringly affected to see in Mr. Lincoln but a second or third rate man, who, like Polk and Pierce, had been taken up merely for the purpose of expediency. Let them ask Mr. Douglas, from whose hands he wrested the popular majority in Illinois; let them ask those, who once felt the magic touch of his lucid mind and honest heart; let his detractors ask their own secret misgivings, and in their own fears they will read the cause of the joy and assurance of his friends. They whistle in order to keep up their courage; but, methinks it is a doleful sound. So, then, we stand before the people, with the platform of free labor, and upon it a true representative of free labor, as a candidate for the presidency. On this attitude we challenge our enemies to the battle.

On our flank we are threatened by the Constitutional Union—nondescript; by that party of dry hearts and dead weights, who recently assembled at Baltimore, and, conscious of their inability to make a platform, adopted a sentence from a fourth of July oration as their common creed, and will in all probability circulate Mr. Everett's Mount Vernon papers as their principal campaign documents. They know no north, no south, no east, no west, no anything, and least of all they know themselves. See them march on, ready to charge, gently and with forbearance, lest they step upon somebody's toes, and slowly and noiselessly, lest their own soldiers, frightened by their own impetuosity, suspect themselves of sinister designs—for theirs is an army which by the accidental explosion of a percussion cap might be thrown into the most frightful disorder. It is said that one of

their candidates contemplates declining the nomination. Let him well ponder what he is doing. Let him not, with his accustomed rashness in political matters, skip over so awful a responsibility; upon his resolution so or so may depend a difference of five or ten votes at the next national election.

In front we face the Democracy. Thanks to the restless impatience of Mr. Douglas's ambition, and to his unscrupulous duplicity, the Democratic party is fast falling to pieces. Indeed we are greatly indebted to that man. When, by the Nebraska bill, and the invention of the popular sovereignty dodge, he tried to gain the favor of the south, he helped build up the Republican party in the north; and when by refusing to acknowledge the logical consequences of his own position, he tried to retrieve his fortunes at the north, he disorganized the Democratic party at the south. And even lately he demonstrated the existence of the irrepressible conflict more clearly and forcibly, with due deference to Gov. Seward be it said, than ten Rochester speeches could have done. He is like the fellow who, in order to get at the apples that hung rather high, cut down the tree. Yes, that man has done much of our work, and he did it voluntarily, gratis, for nothing. Let us be honest enough to confess it; for, sir, I really do not see why the church should refuse to acknowledge its obligations to the devil.

It is not owing to his laudable exertions that the Democracy have opened the campaign with two platforms and *nary* candidate? In fact, when taking all his kind services into consideration, I am almost sorry of ever having said anything against that man. But the thing is done, and Mr. Douglas must be satisfied with as humble an apology as I am able to offer.

The first attempt of the Democracy to unite upon a platform and to nominate a candidate failed. It could not but fail so long as some of them insisted on laying down a party creed that meant something. A Democratic platform, in order to be satisfactory, must mean nothing and everything, as the Cincinnati platform did. But they will try again to repress the irrepressible conflict which rages in their own ranks, and as the day for doing so they have with great propriety chosen the 18th of June, the anniversary of the battle of Waterloo. What the result of that Convention will be, whether one of the contesting factions will carry the day, or whether they will succeed in uniting them, by conceding to one the platform, and to the other the candidates, thus cheating each other in attempting to cheat the people, is to me a matter of supreme indifference. The Democrats undoubtedly thought they had done a very smart thing in adjourning their Convention without nominating a candidate, so as to deprive us of the supposed advantage of knowing what antagonist we had to deal with. Without being aware of it, they have indeed done a great thing for us; for they have obliged us to rely for success upon the positive strength of our cause, instead of the accidental weakness of an opposite candidate. And in this noble and manly attitude we stand before them the only united National party in the land.

While the Union-savers did not dare to lay down a common party creed —while the Democrats, with unscrupulous duplicity, attempt to commit a new fraud upon the people—the Republican party has, with manly fearlessness, proclaimed its principles and nominated a candidate who fairly and honestly represents them. We have undertaken to defeat our opponents, not by concession and subterfuge, but by boldly and unequivocally reasserting the principles in which we believe. We have undertaken to disarm the prejudices that are against us, not by pandering to them, but by

opposing to them the language of truth. No greediness of a speedy party triumph has betrayed us into the abandonment of a single position; no desire to conclude advantageous alliances has betrayed us into a single compromise. I am proud to say we have disdained to purchase, at the price of a single article of our creed, the support of that small set of amphibious politicians who claim to hold the balance of power, and whose office it seems to have been, for years, to demoralize parties with their treacherous promises of support; of those heartless men who, when a whole continent is on fire, calculate with bloodless coolness from what side they can draw the greatest advantage.

They may feel big with the vain boast that they will be strong enough to defeat us—we have shown them unequivocally enough, that they will never be strong enough to corrupt us. We have, indeed, invited the support of all citizens, whatever their party affiliations may have been. But we will not gain it by false pretences. We will speak to them the language of great principles, we will appeal to their sense of right and justice, we will assault their understandings with irrefutable arguments, we will storm their hearts with solemn invocations, but we have disdained to descend to ambiguous tricks, which would make us unworthy of being supported by others.

Such is the Republican party of to-day. It is strong, for it seeks and finds its strength in the greatness of the cause it defends. It will be victorious, for it deserves success. Its success will be a decisive triumph of our cause, and if the worst should come, even a defeat would be a mere delay of certain victory. And so we are ready to give battle, armed with that scrupulous jealousy of principle, that will make us rather perish than compromise the right; with that honest pride of conviction which springs from a deep consciousness of good faith and a true devotion to a just cause. And the signs of the times show that even in politics honesty is the best policy, for all honest men who mean to do right, although they formerly stood against us, are fast flocking around our banner. Listen to me a single moment. Standing as we do on the threshold of great decisions, I cannot suffer my mind to be engaged in the walls of this house, or in the narrow lines of party interest and party policy, not even in the boundaries of this country. There is the wide world around us with its manifold races of nations and men, all of them for thousands of years engaged in the arduous struggle for happiness and freedom, now advancing with spasmodic force and rapidity, now falling back again exhausted and discouraged; always struggling to disentangle their feet from the treacherous coils of despotic rule, and always baffled in their efforts; so much noble blood spilled, so many noble hearts broken, so many noble aspirations turned into despair!

And in this world of strife and anguish there arose this Republic, a world of promise. It was the gospel of liberty translated into fact. It was to be the beacon of humanity. But alas! the oblivion of despotic rule did not work the abolition of the baser passions of human nature. But half a century elapsed and this free government is ruled by a despotic interest, the Republic sinks into the mire of Slavery and corruption, sinks deeper and deeper, and the hope of humanity sinks with it. The advocates of despotism predict its downfall from day to day, and proclaim with exultation that the great experiment of human self-government has failed. It is in vain that the best men of the nation, like the prophets of old, rise up against the growing demoralization. They are sneered at and persecuted, or, at best, their efforts remain isolated and apparently fruitless.

Suddenly a great startling outrage is perpetrated; the slave power, with its train of corruption and demoralization, shows itself in its naked deformity, and threatens to swallow down the whole future of the country in one gulp.

Now the popular conscience wakes up. The people of the North rise to a last great effort. The first attempt to rescue the development of the Republic from the grasp of that despotic power fails, but the movement grows in dimensions and intensity. We press on and on, and the day of deliverance is at hand. Oh, it comes at last! How we have longed to see it! How we counted every minute by the impatient throbbings of our hearts! We rally in formidable array; every fiber of our being trembles with eagerness for the greatest of struggles; every pulsation of our blood beats the charge! We place one of the purest, noblest and ablest men of the nation at the head of our army—victory is within our grasp!

No man in whose soul glows a spark of sympathy with struggling humanity, can now stand idle. No heart that was ever fired by the divine breath of liberty, can now remain cold.

Let Wisconsin stretch her hand across the great lakes and grasp that of New York. Let it be known that New York and Wisconsin, who stood together to the last for Seward in the Convention, will be the first and foremost in the battle for Lincoln and Liberty!

Property in the Territories.

SPEECH

OF

HON. BENJAMIN F. WADE,

OF OHIO,

Delivered in the Senate of the United States, March 7, 1860.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the following resolutions, submitted by Mr. Brown on the 18th of January:

"*Resolved*, That the Territories are the common property of all the States, and that it is the privilege of the citizens of all the States to go into the Territories with every kind or description of property recognized by the Constitution of the United States, and held under the laws of any of the States; and that it is the constitutional duty of the law-making power, wherever lodged, or by whomsoever exercised, whether by the Congress or the Territorial Legislature, to enact such laws as may be found necessary for the adequate and sufficient protection of such property.

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Territories be instructed to insert, in any bill they may report for the organization of new Territories, a clause declaring it to be the duty of the Territorial Legislature to enact adequate and sufficient laws for the protection of all kinds of property, as above described, within the limits of the Territory; and that, upon its failure or refusal to do so, it is the admitted duty of Congress to interpose and pass such laws."

The pending question was on the amendment offered by Mr. Wilkinson, to strike out all after the word "resolved," where it first occurs, and insert:

"That the Territories are the common property of the *people* of the United States; that Congress has full power and authority to pass all laws necessary and proper for the government of such Territories; and that, in the exercise of such power, it is the duty of Congress so to legislate in relation to slavery therein that the interests of free labor may be encouraged and protected in such Territories.

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Territories be instructed to insert, in any bill they may report for the organization of new Territories, a clause declaring that there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in such Territories, except in punishment for crime whereof the party has been duly convicted."

Mr. WADE. Mr. President, these resolutions bring up at once before the Senate two distinct and opposite systems of labor and civilization. The resolutions which are proposed by the Democratic portion of the Senate declare in favor of that one of those two systems which, in my judgment, is subversive of the melioration and progress of human society on this continent. The public mind, North, South, East and West, is intensely engaged in making its choice between that system and the scheme of civilization which is asserted by the resolutions submitted by the Republican side of the Chamber. I cannot, therefore, exaggerate the importance of this debate. It is a very extraordinary thing, Mr. President, that the loudest complaints of maladministration of this Government, and the noisiest alarms of imminent danger to the country, come from those who, for a very considerable period, have had possession of its vast revenues, control of its mighty power, influence of its agents and clients, equally at the capital and in every nook and corner of the land, and so have formed and directed its policy, without encountering any effective resistance or opposition. The Republican party has been always, as it is now, absolutely powerless to impress its principles on the administration of the Government. It stands by and looks on, wondering at the progress of Democratic administration; and wondering, most of all, at hearing those who have conducted it entirely in their own way now threatening to pull down the pillars of the Union, and involve them all, with themselves,

☞For Sale at the Office of the Albany Evening Journal. Price, per Single Copy, 2c.; per Dozen Copies, 20c.; per Hundred, $1; per Thousand, $8.

in a common ruin. In the name of God, Mr. President, what does all this mean? There is but one explanation of facts so strange and anomalous; and that explanation is, that you still want to continue the administration, when you have found out that you cannot administer successfully, or even with safety, for your own system.

Mr. President, if there is a Senator here who will gainsay me in my next preliminary observation, let him now look me full in the face and deny, if he can, that his section has had its full share of political power in this country, from the hour when the Government was organized until the exact moment when I am speaking. More than this, your power in the Government has been altogether disproportioned to your numbers. I blame nobody for this, because I know that it is human nature to use all the power we have for the advancement of our own principles, our interests, and our accepted policies. Undoubtedly, under similar circumstances, we of the North would do the same; therefore I do not complain, but simply state the fact.

If, now, the present course of administration of the Government has so far proved a failure that you are now prepared to pull it down over our heads, pray tell us who is to blame but yourselves? Sir, it is very manifest, from the confessions of the complainants, that they have no present or real cause of complaint. The secret really is, that uprising political principles, which they are no longer able to keep down, cast a shadow across their path which disturbs their equanimity.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] told us that the South is in possession of eight hundred and fifty thousand square miles of country, the most genial and beautiful that God ever bestowed upon men. He said that he was proud of it; and he has a right to be. He said that this fine region is capable of sustaining a population greater than that of all Europe. I believe that he spoke within bounds. He told us that that region has twelve million people; mark you, sir, only twelve million. But we all know that the area of the slaveholding States is greater by about one-third than that of the free States; while its population is at least one-third less. He spoke glowingly of the prosperity of the slaveholding States. What, then, could be more unreasonable and absurd than these whinings and complaints of Northern aggressions and oppressions by the great and prosperous South, when the North is entirely out of power? If he speaks relatively, then he speaks correctly. Property in slaves was never so prosperous as to-day. Look into the slave market; you will find that slaves never brought higher prices than now. Of course, slave labor is more profitable to the owner now than it has ever been. Sir, these Southern gentlemen are inconsistent and contradictory; in one breath they are all boast and glory, in the next it is all despair and destruction. Please reconcile some of these contradictions.

If the North has, by means of its underground railroads, fatally and treacherously sapped and undermined the foundations of your whole system of labor, how is it that your property has risen in value, and your prosperity culminated, during all the time it has been going on?

One other preliminary remark, Mr. President. The Senator from Georgia rose here in his place, with a solemnity unusual for him, and with a countenance which was the very personation of despair, and announced to an astonished people that we, the Senators on this side of the chamber, are the enemies of his country. Yes, sir; he felt that we are enemies of his country, and therefore that power would be unsafely and dangerously lodged in our hands. Why, sir, would it be unsafe and dangerous? Certainly they have suffered no damage from us, so far. He argues after this fashion: he complains that we have been faithless in the execution of his fugitive law, and *therefore* the slave property of the South is insecure; but you will remember, sir, that, long before he got through with his speech, the slaves in Georgia were so loyal to their masters that, from the days of the revolutionary war to the present time, not one hundred of all their black generations have fled from bondage. Sir, if there are those whose nature is so grateful that they can thank you for nothing, there are others whose nature is so discontented that they will complain upon very trifling cause. Only one poor negro a year, in eighty years, has escaped from the great State of Georgia; and yet he trembles with rage, declares war, and lays hold upon the pillars of the Union. One poor negro a year, and even that negro not certainly lost through the Abolitionists or the aggressions of the North. The Senator

does not condescend to tell us how any or all the hundred have been spirited away; but is content with boasting that all who have been lost, from all causes whatever, do not exceed a hundred.

Mr. President, when gentlemen come here and volunteer such arguments as these, it is perfectly evident that there is some motive stronger than any consciousness of injury received at the hands of those they accuse. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] seems to have been specially assigned to act as attorney-general; and he has brought in a bill of indictment, charging upon the Senators on this side of the chamber pretty much all the crimes known in the calendar. It is an indictment interspersed with something of argument, more of declamation, and yet more of vituperation. Now, sir, I acknowledge him to be well and worthily assigned to this duty, for he is one of the ablest and most experienced members of the Senate. If a case could be made out at all against the North, he is just the man to make it out. I have already conceded his ability. All who heard his speech will admit that he does not lack the necessary zeal. If he has failed, he may say, with another noted character, that he "fell where Satan could not stand." [Laughter.] Sir, he has failed—utterly, totally failed. I pass by, for the moment, the impeachments of treason and perjury, to reach another, namely, an impeachment of cowardice—an impeachment which I confess grated more harshly on my ear than all the other vituperations in which he indulged.

The Senator from Georgia said that we, the Republican Senators here, "and the untold millions we represent, have fallen so low, that we have not only lost our virtue, but with it we have lost our courage, so that we have not the spirit to resent an injury." Did the Senator believe the declaration which he made? If he did believe it, and I have no doubt he did, from the tenor of his language, he believed that on this side of the chamber we were all non-combatants. I will not suppose that he intended to earn a cheap reputation for valor by insulting those whom he supposed would never accept a challenge. Mr. President, the whole world knows, and therefore the Senator from Georgia must know, that the people of the free States of this Union have utterly condemned, repudiated and abolished the old and barbarious practice of dueling; every intelligent man knows, and therefore the Senator from Georgia knows, that if a Senator here from either of these States should engage in a duel, he would, for that cause alone, whatever might be his excuse, be deserted and proscribed; that he would be treated as an outcast; while, if he should kill his adversary, he would be subjected to indictment and trial for murder, and would forever be excluded from all public trust of honor or profit. This tone of high moral sentiment is just and righteous in itself, and I do not mean to gainsay it now; but I do feel that it has placed me at a disadvantage here. I feel it frequently; I feel that it often places all of us here at the mercy of those who, not having adopted the same just sentiments, act towards us as if they construed our constrained forbearance into a want of courage. Our Northern people have no reason to distrust the courage of any portion of their fellow-citizens. Physical courage, with our Northern people, is a sentiment so general, that I must say that it is cheapened by its universality. No man suspects another to be a coward; for it would be an exception to almost a universal rule. Who ever has seen the Northern people called into the field of combat to maintain their rights, and not known that braver men never stepped upon the quarter-deck, braver men never entered the perilous breach? Who ever heard of a coward among them all, where duty calls? Sir, we on this side, if I understand the Senator from Georgia, and the untold millions whom we represent, have not the courage to maintain our honor. Even if I thought that——

Mr. TOOMBS. I refer the honorable Senator to my speech. I made no such allegation against the people of the North. I said that people who did not maintain their obligations, (and I was alluding especially to the Republican party,) people who would violate their compacts, were not to be dreaded when they threatened to march down their millions upon us. The speech is in print. There is no such allegation against the people of the North; but the gentlemen seem to consider themselves the people of the North, and I do not. That is the difference between us.

Mr. WADE. Here is precisely what the Senator did say: I may construe it differently from him, perhaps. Let us see what was his language:

"I doubt if there be five, out of all the members of the Republican party on this floor, who will stand up

here to-day, and say they are willing, either by State or Federal legislation, or in any other manner, to uphold and comply with this provision of the Constitution. I do not believe there are enough to meet God's final requisition to save Sodom. No, sir; they mock at constitutional obligations, jeer at oaths."

A little further on he said:

"They place great reliance on this arm of the Black Republican phalanx [alluding to the slaves, I suppose]. When they get ready for this brotherly work, in the name and behalf of my constituents I extend to them a cordial invitation to come down to see us. But it is due to candor to say that their reputation needs some building up among my constituents. We do not think those men the most dangerous who are the most faithless to their compacts; and, in very truth, we have but small fear of men, even as leaders of untold millions, who have not manhood enough to maintain and defend their own honors."

I supposed that the leader was as courageous, at all events, as those he led. That was the construction that I put upon it. I supposed that it was a declaration that we, and those whom we represent, lacked that courage which is necessary to maintain our own honor when it is impeached. If the gentleman says that was not——

Mr. TOOMBS. I call the Senator's attention to this: I said that those persons who were faithless to their compacts, who passed personal liberty bills, were not to be dreaded; and there is no other construction, I think, to be put on the language fairly, though the Senator can give it what construction he pleases.

Mr. WADE. I accept the gentleman's construction of it. I put a much larger construction on it than that; but I am very glad to hear the Senator's explanation, because I see that it is no particular merit to us, nor to the gentlemen on that side, that we generally have physical courage. We inherit it from our heroic ancestors, who, when occasion required it, dragged guilty kings from their thrones, and deprived them of their crowns, because they undertook to trample upon the rights of the people; and we, their descendants, I trust in God, are as ready to vindicate, not only our honor, but our rights, as were our ancestors, at any period.

I do not differ widely with the Senator on one point. The man who would be faithless to his obligations, and would commit perjury, I think would be very apt to be a coward; but on the subject of dueling, I do not wish to be misunderstood either here or by our people at home. I agree with them, that it is a barbarous mode of settling difficulties at best, and ought to be totally unnecessary in the advanced stage of civilization to which we have arrived in this country. The restraints of civilized life with us are generally sufficient, and they ought to be always sufficient among us, to oblige every man to suppress violent utterances and to keep within bounds of moderation and respectful consideration of the rights and feelings of others. The case may be quite different in semi-civilized communities, where there are no such other restraints. I do not know but the duel may be necessary there. In any community, if a man cannot be restrained from offering insult by any more elevated principle than fear, it may be necessary that he be compelled to respect the rights of others, even by the fear of combat. And I do not say that I should not, in an extreme case, maintain my own rights in that barbarous way here, whatever might be thought of it at home. I have said enough, Mr. President, I trust, on that point.

The Senator charges us all with perjury and disloyalty to the Constitution. Just see, now, how inconsistent a gentleman, in the heat of argument, may become. He has taken here an oath to support the Constitution; the same oath which we have taken, and which he accuses us of breaking; and yet he announced to us that he is impatient—nay, eager—for a symbol of war from the Old Dominion against the Constitution and the Union. I do not use his exact language, though I have it before me. He is ready and eager to second her motion. "One blast from her bugle-horn," he said, "would call to their feet a million of men." A million of men, sir! A million of men for what? Why, a million of men to topple down the pillars of this Republic, and overwhelm the whole country in one universal ruin.

And all this the million of men roused by the bugle-horn of the Old Dominion are to do next March, if a Republican shall be elected, constitutionally elected President, in November. Does he not stand on high ground, sir? I ask him to say, for himself, that he occupies high vantage ground, while charging us with treason and violation of our oaths, when he is with the same breath threatening to pull down the pillars of the Union. Sir, if this is not treason, then I do not know what it is. If it is not a violation of the oath to support the Constitution, then I do not understand the import of the words. I know, indeed, that these things are said in the heat of debate, and may mean but very little; but they go out to the world as deliberate debates, and therefore must be noticed here.

And now I dismiss this point, and pass from the declamation to the argument of the gentleman from Georgia; for, as I have said, he is among the ablest of his class. No man is more competent to make out a case against the Republicans or the people of the North. He has deliberated long; he has studied deeply, not merely in the history of ancient and modern Europe, but even in the history of ancient Greece, to fortify his argument. What does his accusation amount to? First, we have not been quite nimble-footed enough in executing his fugitive law. He gives us not one instance, not one case of delinquency. He is content with making a general charge, that we are faithless to the Constitution in this respect. Now, sir, I know of no case of resistance to the execution of the fugitive law in the State of Ohio. I know a great many men there who believe, before God and man, that it is unconstitutional, yet I know of no man who has stood forth to resist its execution. On the contrary, whenever a case under it has come before our courts, it has been carefully scrutinized, and the law has been most rigorously executed. There have been doubtful cases; there have even been cases in which there was little room left for doubt that the seeming remedies granted by that law have been perverted to the atrocious purpose of kidnapping and carrying freemen into slavery.

A citizen of Ohio, not long ago, whose name I do not now recollect, was taken to St. Louis, and there imprisoned under State law, to be sold into slavery to pay the charges of his detention, until he was released by the people of Ohio. This was no solitary case; such cases frequently occur. I meet the general charge with a general denial; and I assert, that the people of Ohio have not been faithless in the execution of this most rigorous, odious, and, as I believe, in many of its provisions, unconstitutional law. I pass briefly over the point that the constitutional provision concerning fugitives devolves on the State Governments, and not upon Congress, the courts having adjudicated that point against my opinions. I will say, however, that no lawyer would agree with the courts, were it a case of the first impression. I deny, moreover, that the decisions of the courts have been uniform, as the Senator from Georgia claims. Judge Hornblower, of New Jersey, on *habeas corpus*, held the law unconstitutional, and discharged the fugitive for that reason. We have one Senator among us here [Mr. WIGFALL] who thinks that the late Mr. Webster knew less of constitutional law than most other men. It is not for me to re-establish Mr. Webster; but whether he knew much or little, it was his deliberate opinion that the law had no warrant in the Constitution, though he deferred to decisions of the courts.

I come now to your new fugitive bill, which, in many of its provisions, I have no doubt is unconstitutional; and I think in these points it has not yet been judged constitutional. It is not, however, my purpose to argue its constitutionality. I meet in this case, as I did in the law of 1793, the vague charge of unfaithfulness on our part with a general denial. I call your attention, sir, to the fact that there prevails among the people very generally an idea that many of the provisions of that law are unconstitutional. This idea tends to produce irritation. Why do the people adopt the idea that it is unconstitutional? The subject being collateral, I will only allude to that section of the law which confers judicial powers on commissioners appointed by the courts, who are not, and cannot, thus appointed, be judges. The people believe this provision unconstitutional, and so do I.

Again: the bill gives ten dollars for a decision in favor of the claimant, and five for a decision in favor of the fugitive. Gentlemen here have ridiculed the idea that such an inducement could bias the magistrate; but I believe, with the people, that such magistrates as you generally have, under this law, would be determined by a thirtieth part of the fee that was paid Judas Iscariot for like services. The people, for what I know, may think this provision unconstitutional. I agree with them so far as to say, that if meanness in a law could make it unconstitutional, the people are right.

Again, there is another provision in the law: when you have got the certificate of the magistrate, the alleged fugitive can be taken out of the State in defiance of the writ of *habeas corpus*. Thus the law, in time of profound peace, strikes down this great writ of freedom, and in this I also agree with them. The law not only denies the writ of *habeas corpus*, but it also denies the trial by jury—an essential right. It is these portions of the law that render it so odious and unpopular. The people know that its execution is attended with dangers to hu-

man freedom, and they are jealous of summary proceedings so extraordinary and unusual.

Sir, we have never denied the obligation of the States to deliver fugitives who are such within the purview of the Constitution of the United States—never, never. But the law is an exceedingly offensive and obnoxious law. You know that, without my telling you. The people of the free States are deeply imbued with the sentiment that, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, as under the law of nature, every innocent man has a right to liberty. They do, however, well know, and so understand, that the Constitution of the United States permits a man in one State, who is held by the laws thereof to owe service or labor to another man, to be reclaimed when he flees from such obligation, to be delivered up to such claimant. This provision of the Constitution our people neither deny nor resist. But the Senator from Georgia, and every other Senator, knows how difficult it is to execute a law which goes against the hearts and consciences of the great mass of the people. We may complain of it; we might even deplore it; but no law-making authority could mend the case. Nothing short of the interposition of Almighty power, changing the hearts of men, can make them prompt and eager to execute your obnoxious law.

I do not stand here to deceive you, my friends. I tell you the truth just as it is. Out of every thousand men who shall see a race between a claimant and a slave, nine hundred and ninety-nine will, from the bottom of their hearts, wish him to escape. Neither you nor I can help the matter by legislation. Acting as magistrates sworn to execute the law, it may be executed when a case is completely made out, beyond all chance for casuistry or cavil; but very little practical benefit can result from it. Who is to be blamed for it? Look at your own section, and you find there human nature exactly the same, when the slave-trader brings the slaves stolen from Africa into your ports in violation of the laws making the act piracy, and denouncing against it the punishment of death. Your jurors acquit him against all evidence and the admonitions of the courts. The innocent men thus stolen from Africa, and thus brought into your States, are irreclaimably sold in your markets; ostentatiously advertised, and sold at your agricultural fairs. I assert, then, that the slave pirate goes abroad with impunity in your States, because your magistrates cannot execute the law. With what face, then, can you stand here, and accuse us of not being swift-footed enough in executing a law which is a greater abomination to us than the laws abolishing the African slave-trade can be to you?

Mr. President, there should be a little reason and common sense exercised in these cases. I do not care if every judge and every marshal may be ever so eager to execute your law; if the hearts of the people, I say again, are opposed to it, who is to blame for that? If there is any blame, it is on Him who moulded the hearts of men. Your law can give you no remedy. You may multiply its penalties; you may make it bristle all over like a porcupine with penalties; it would be of no service to you; because, although when you get a case you may execute it under the oaths of your magistrates, ninety-nine times in one hundred, the people being against you, the fugitive will find a way to escape in precisely the same way that your pirates, who bring men from Africa and sell them in the market, constantly escape with you. Now, sir, I would have just as much ground to stand here and accuse the whole South of being guilty of perjury, and guilty of the most manifest violation of all law, because the victims of the Wanderer were not released, and the officers of that vessel condemned and executed, as they deserved to be, as you have to stand forth and say that we on our part do not execute laws equally and far more odious to us.

The next accusation, and the strongest one, of the Senator from Georgia, is, that we pass what he calls personal liberty bills, which were, as he claimed, in violation of the Constitution of the United States; and he said that the State of Ohio occupied the same position with the other free States in that particular. Well, sir, as he placed Ohio upon the same ground with the others, I have not taken pains to examine the action of the others, trusting that if there was no foundation under heaven for the charge he made against Ohio, it was equally groundless against the other States. I say, then, to that Senator and the Senate, that the State of Ohio has never passed a law in violation of the Constitution of the United States; that it never has been derelict in its duty in this respect. Does any Senator here suppose

that a sovereign State in this Union is going to relinquish all her right of protection over her citizens, because there is a provision of the Federal Constitution by which a certain class of individuals may be taken out of the State? That would be to abandon every individual to the ruthless claim of any unprincipled man who sought to claim him. Cannot a sovereign State of this Union prevent the kidnapping of her free citizens, because you have a right to claim a slave fleeing from service?

The Constitution of the United States does indeed say that the escaping fugitive shall be given up. But it does not prescribe how the fact that he owes service shall be ascertained; and the Constitution of the United States does not mean that any freeman of a State shall be given up as a fugitive. Now, I appeal to the candor of the Senator from Georgia. He has read with great care the proceedings of the Federal Constitutional Convention. He knows the jealousy concerning State rights that pervaded that body. Does he believe that its members would have ever consented to a provision which would have deprived the States of the power to protect and defend their own citizens? No, sir, never.

You are continually repeating the assertion that this fugitive slave law provision was deemed an important one by the fathers, and that the Union could not have been effected without it. On the contrary, sir, it was a mere afterthought. The Constitution was complete, in all its important provisions, before any man thought of this thing. It was put into the Constitution with very little deliberation; and those who put it there had no idea that, in doing so, they were taking away from the States the most important element of sovereignty — namely, their power to protect their own citizens against unlawful seizures and searches and extradition. The rights of the States, the only protection made against overpowering and concentrated despotism, were the one especial object of preservation. The States battled inch by inch against the surrender of any State power. I judge, therefore, that they never intended to confer upon Congress, or upon any one State, or anybody, a right to enter another sovereign State, and take away, in a summary and arbitrary manner, whomsoever he should choose to claim as a fugitive from another State.

But the Senator said that the free States, and Ohio among the rest, have committed a kind of perjury in disregarding your fugitive law, by passing personal liberty bills. So far as the law of Ohio is concerned, we shall see how plain a tale will put down his argument. Her law consists of three sections. The saving clause of the last section prevents any such construction as the Senator himself put upon the statute. It is entitled, "A law to prevent slaveholding and kidnapping in Ohio." The last section declares:

"Nothing in the preceding sections of this act shall apply to any act done by any person under the authority of the Constitution of the United States, or of any law of the United States made in pursuance thereof."

Now, I ask the Senator from Georgia, if he was upon the bench, and a fugitive from labor or service in another State was brought before him, under the provisions of this law, would he find any difficulty in surrendering him into the hands of the person who had made out his claim to his service? Would he say that the preceding section of this law overruled this explanatory clause, and that he was bound, at all events, to trample the Constitution under foot? No, sir; he would give it no such construction as that.

Mr. President, I say in all sincerity and earnestness to every man who holds to the conservation of State rights, that you endanger the rights of your own State, you endanger the liberties of this whole nation, when you contend against the power of the States to pass laws protecting their own citizens from unlawful seizures and kidnapping. At all hazards, neither asperity of language, nor a frowning brow, nor violent denunciation, will ever induce the State of Ohio to forget what belongs to her sovereignty, what is due to her honor, and the protection of her own citizens. She takes no prouder position on this subject than, I hope in God, every other State in the Union does. Then the Senator was wrong, he was uncandid, to stand forth and say that our constituents are perjured, that they are traitors, that they have violated the law of the land, when they had taken every precaution to award to the citizens of other States, holding a species of property that we utterly repudiate, all their rights.

The State of Ohio sends no Senators here to denounce the sovereignties or people of other States; but when her rights are disputed or her honor assailed in this high council, her ambassadors here would be unfaithful to their trust if they did not hurl back such unjust imputations.

The third count in the Senator's indictment is, that we intend to prohibit slavery in the vast Territories of this Union. That charge, I confess, is true. We do so intend. If I understand the objects and purposes of the Republican party, if I understand the emergencies of the case that brought that great party into existence, it was this very subject. The General Government, acting in Congress, faithlessly to all that it had covenanted heretofore, had broken down every barrier, and violated every pledge it had given of freedom in any of our Territories. These covenants being overthrown, the Republican party arose to rescue freedom. Had there been no violation of the Missouri compromise, it is very probable there would have been no Republican party here. We did embody ourselves into a party, in order to rescue, protect, and defend, the free Territories of this country against the pollution of slavery. I have no concealments to make. There we now stand; this is our platform; on it we will stand forever.

But the Senator says that the slaveholders have an undoubted right to go with their slaves into the Territories of the United States, under the Constitution of the United States; and he claims that a decision of the Supreme Court gives them that warrant. There is no man who has more reverence for the decision of honest courts, when made on due deliberation, upon matters of private right, and within their jurisdiction, than I have. I know how essential it is to the peace and welfare of every community that the decisions of courts settling the private rights of men in the last resort, even if they are believed to be wrong, must be lived up to and have effect. That has been my education—my principle; what I have held always, and hold to-day; but in just as much as I revere an honest court, keeping within its own jurisdiction, restraining itself from all political considerations, and adjudging the rights of men according to the law in its purity, so in exact proportion do I abhor and scout from me a corrupt judge, who, for any purpose, will impertinently reach over, outside, and beyond the case before him, and endeavor to advance the political cause of one party or another by decisions that he may pretend to make.

Sir, it is the same with Federal courts as with every other. The moment a Federal court transcends its legitimate authority, for the purpose of effecting some political object its interference is impertinent; it is of no validity; and, with the high courts of Georgia, I say, I hold it in utter contempt. Yes, sir, [to Mr. Toombs,] I like the spirit of your courts, from which you are now so ready to depart. They stood up against what they considered a corrupt decision of this Federal court, and said they held it in utter contempt. That was right. Well, sir, if there ever was a holding on God's earth that would warrant any judge, private man, or Senator, in saying that he held it in utter contempt, it is what is called the Dred Scott decision, so manifestly a usurpation of power; so manifestly done in order to give a bias to political action, that no man, though he be a fool, can fail to see it.

What was the case? An old negro, whom age had rendered valueless, happens to fall in the way of the politicians at a period when it was thought exceedingly desirable that the question of Congressional authority over slavery in the Territories shall be tried, and Dred Scott prosecutes for his liberty in the Federal courts; and, by the way, after he had prosecuted his case through, and his liberty was denied him by the court, I believe the very next day the master gave him his liberty. He had served the purposes of the politicians, and they ought to have given him a pension for life for having been the John Doe of the transaction. I do not know of what authority the case may be, but its getting-up looks to me exceedingly suspicious. There was a concurrence of circumstances that very rarely happen of themselves. Old Dred Scott sued for his freedom, and a plea was put in that he, being a descendant of an African, and his ancestors slaves, he could not sue in that court; he had no right to be there, had no standing there. The court go on and argue themselves into the belief that either a man may be so monstrously low, or the court itself so monstrously high, that he cannot sue in its presence for his rights. I believe this is the first nation on God's earth that ever placed any mortal man, or anybody bearing the human form, on so low a level, or any court on so high a one, as that. But let this go. Dred Scott brought his suit. The plea in abatement was demurred to; the question arose upon that demurrer, and a majority of the court decided that Dred Scott, being a negro, a descendant of an African, and his ancestors having been slaves, he could not main

tain a suit in that court, because he was not a citizen, under the law. Now, sir, I ask every lawyer here, was not there an end of the case? In the name of God, Judge Taney, what did you retain it for any longer? You said Dred Scott could not sue; he could not obtain his liberty; he was out of court; and what further had you to do with all the questions that you say were involved in that suit? Upon every principle of adjudication, you ought not to have gone further. No court has ever held it more solemnly than the Federal courts, that they will not go on to decide any more than is before the court, and necessary to make the decision; and every lawyer knows that if they do, all they say more is mere talk, and, though said by judges in a court-house, has just as much operation and effect as if it had been said by a horse-dealer, in a bar-room, and no more. And yet we are told that we must follow the *dicta* of these packed judges—for they were packed, and I have about as little respect for a packed court as I have for a packed jury—a majority of them interested, too, as I believe, in the very question to be decided; for, I believe, the majority who concurred in the opinion were all slaveholders, and, of course, if anybody was interested to give a favorable construction to the holders of that species of property, these men were interested in the question.

Strange as it may appear, those who complain of Northern aggression have not only every other department under their feet, but with less than one-third of the population of the North, you happen to have a majority of the Supreme Court on your side, and always have had. I will not say that that is the reason why the decisions of courts of late are magnified into such importance. Immaculate their decisions are now, it seems. The very party who, a few years ago, within the memory of us all, held that their decisions were of no effect whatever on governmental action, when coming in conflict with the views of the President or the co-ordinate branches of the Government, have turned round of late, and have found a virtue in that court that can ride triumphantly over every other department of this Government. It is a palpable heresy, and must be abandoned. The liberties of this nation cannot consist with the doctrine now set up on the other side of this Chamber with regard to your Supreme Court.

I do not want to go back to see what Jefferson and others said about it. I know the nature of man. I know, as they knew, that to arm this judiciary with a power, not only to decide questions between private individuals, but to affect the legislation of the nation, to affect the action of your President, to affect the co-ordinate branches of this Government, is a fatal heresy that, if persisted in by a majority of the people, cannot result in any other than an utter consolidated despotism; and I am amazed that men who have had their eyes open, and who have held to other doctrines in better days, should, for any temporary purpose, heave overboard, and bury in the deep sea, the sheet-anchor of the liberties of this nation.

I say to my friends on the other side—for I call them friends for this purpose—we are all interested alike in this question. God knows, if you once have it established, and acquiesced in by the people of this Union, that the *dicta* of the Supreme Court—a political court by its very constitution, yea, packed on this very subject, as every Senator here knows—are to be the laws binding on every other department, we have the meanest despotism that ever prevailed on God Almighty's earth. But I have no fears of it, sir. You may effect a temporary purpose by it; but a doctrine so absurd, so incompatible with the minds of the Anglo-Saxon race, so inconsistent with the great principles of free government, will never be permitted to stand.

In the Dred Scott decision—I will not call it a decision, but in this *dictum*, this talk of the judges, for that was all it was—they overturned every decision their own court had made for more than seventy years; they holding, prior to that time, that Congress had full and plenary power over the Territories of the United States. Judge Marshall so decided, and the court had followed his decision, and every other department of the government was well satisfied. Therefore, this infallible court can overturn the most settled decisions of its own and of other courts, and nobody can question its acts! A strange doctrine that, that the sayings of men who were put upon the bench under the most questionable circumstances, packed for a particular decision, and not having a chance even to make that upon the question before them, should be the *ne plus ultra*, after they themselves have overturned all that have gone before them. This is a position that cannot outlive this generation.

Where did these judges find the power in the Constitution of the United States to carry slavery into the Territories? If they had anything to ground their *dicta* upon, they had the power to show it written in the Constitution of the United States; but there is no such thing there. I remember very well reading (for I was not here at that time) that in 1850 Mr. Calhoun set up this doctrine, and it was so extreme that he had no second in the Senate. He was challenged by Mr. Clay upon it. Mr. Clay told him he was amazed and astonished that any man should hold such a doctrine, and he asked him: "Where do you find your constitutional warrant for it?" and told him, at the same time, that it was more latitudinous than anything ever held by old John Adams and the Federal party at any period. Mr. Calhoun, I think, found no warrant in the Constitution; he did not deign to reply. Yet, within ten years, this doctrine has grown up into a great tree, so that some fowls lodge in the branches thereof. [Laughter.]

They find no warrant in the Constitution; they find none in legal logic or reason. It is said now that the Territories being the common property of the States, the citizens of each State have a right to go into them with any property that they perchance may have. I deny the postulate. These Territories do not belong to the States, as States. They belong to the people of the United States. Congress is the trustee for them; but no State can claim any portion of them. The States, as States, have nothing to do with them. Suppose the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] owns a plantation in Mississippi, in his own right or that of his children, and he has slaves there working upon that plantation, while he is a resident of the State of Illinois. Suppose there is a Congressional prohibition saying that he cannot take his property into that new Territory. Let me ask these casuists now, which State is it whose sovereignty is invaded; that where the Senator lives, or that where the negroes live? Can anybody tell me? State equality, they say, is not preserved. But the State equality of which State? Illinois, where the slaves are owned, is her sovereignty hewed down, or the sovereignty of the State of Mississippi, where the negroes hoe the Senator's corn and pick his cotton? There never has been a respectable argument for any such position as that.

May not the same ground be applied to other cases? Suppose we had annexed—as I presume we shall ultimately annex—the Fejee Islands to this nation. In those islands, the people not only enslave each other, but they actually kill and eat each other. Now, suppose a Senator from the State of Fejee should appear in this body; suppose that he should claim the right of his constituents to bring their chattels into any of our Territories, and claim the right of the law in that country to practise cannibalism upon them, that he might roast and boil them as well as enslave them. He would claim, if you did not permit this to be done, "that the State of Fejee has not equal rights with the other States of this Union; a gentleman owns his property; it is an undoubted law of my State that we may fatten men for the roast, and we have a right to bring them here for the same purpose; and if you do not permit us to do so, we will pull down the columns of the Republic, laying it outspread in one universal ruin." [Laughter.] I suppose the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] would say, "The Territories have a perfect right to vote cannibalism in or to vote it out; I do not care whether they vote it up or down; but they have the right, and shall be perfectly free to do it." [Laughter.] Another Senator would arise, and say that the people of Fejee not only have the right to bring them in, but they have the right to be protected in doing so there under the laws of Congress. Another one says that Congress has no power to pass laws on that subject whatever; but the courts, which are now omnipotent in all things, may, without law, declare what the law is, and we must all bow down to it. There is a difference even on the other side as to these shades or colors of Congressional authority; but, nevertheless, you are all in for spreading slavery to the ends of the earth.

Take another case—one that is likely to occur a little sooner, perhaps. Suppose Brigham Young should come from the State of Utah, when it is a State, into Kansas, or any other Territory, and bring with him his forty wives, and the Territory has a law that a man shall have but one wife. Brigham says, "These are my property; yea, more than my property; yea, they are forty ribs taken out of my body while I slept; I must bring them in here, or the State of Utah will not be on an equal footing with the other States of this Union."

Away with such logic. There is no guaranty in the Constitution of the United States for such a position as that. Our safety, Mr. President, consists in keeping close to the Constitution. Whatever we claim, let us find the direct warrant for it there, or the necessary implication to carry out some other power that is manifestly granted. The moment we go astray from this, we are in the fog; we are in dispute; we endanger the harmony of our action, and it is done in this instance. In this great departure from the earlier principles of this Government, you have involved portions of the nation in almost irretrievable hostility to each other. Let us go back to the Constitution, and follow it.

Mr. President, I will notice one other position. Waiving all constitutional law on this subject—for we are not compelled to do all that we have a constitutional right to do—I will suppose, for the purposes of this argument, that you have authority to take your slaves into a Territory, and hold them there; still, is it expedient, is it just and proper to do it? This brings up a question which has been incidentally debated during this session several times. Originally, it now stands confessed here; the framers of our institutions, the fathers of the Republic, all, I believe, without a dissenting voice, (if there were any, I do not know it,) held that slaveholding was against common right, was against natural right, was wrong in itself, and therefore should not be cherished or encouraged.

Now, Senators say here, that the slaveholding States have reconsidered this subject with great deliberation, and they have found that this old view was wrong; that slavery is a normal condition; that it is a blessing to society; that it is the best state and condition that a man can be in, and therefore ought to be extended. That is the only issue which I wish to draw in upon this subject with any party, because I know that your determination now to extend slavery into the Territories arises from this new philosophy of yours. If you are right upon that, I will go with you. If you are right, let us extend slavery to the four winds of heaven; let us employ missionaries to preach the glories of slavery, and induce the whole world to divide itself, and one-half become slaveholders, and the other half slaves.

Sir, I am glad to see this great question placed at last upon a solid foundation; for every man knows that no political principle can be based permanently on anything short of eternal justice and right. Now, I do not care for what the Senator from Georgia and others have told us, that slaveholding was the basis upon which society had been founded for thirty centuries. We, at least, have discovered that it is a sandy foundation. It is fast washing away; and in exact proportion to the advance of mankind in civilization and in knowledge, on all hands this old principle is deemed barbarous, and is wearing away. Upon that issue, I will meet you; it is a fair one. If it is right, extend it; if it is wrong, let it die the death, as all error and falsehood must die. I hardly know how to meet this issue in argument; for I have been in the habit of believing, with the fathers of the Constitution, that liberty is the gift of God to every human being. With them, I have supposed it is self-evident, and incapable of illustration by argument. I would appeal from all your casuistry to the promptings of the human heart. Who within the sound of my voice would not say, with the immortal Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death?" If there be any, let him speak. Who had not rather infinitely follow a friend or relation to the grave, than into the shambles of slavery? Not a man. Human nature revolts at it.

I know it is said that the African is an inferior race, incapable of defending his own rights. My ethics teach me, if it be so, that this fact, so far from giving me a right to enslave him, requires that I shall be more scrupulous of his rights; but I know that, whether he be equal to me or not, he is still a human being; negroes are still men. Senators will bear me witness that there are thousands now in bondage who are much more white than black—yea, tens of thousands of such; but, whether white or black, I say again, they are still human; they are animated by the same hopes, they are afflicted with the same sorrows, they are actuated by the same motives, that we are. Like us, they may be deprived of every right; they may be treated like brutes; their souls may be ignored; you may whip, scourge, and trample them in the dust; but they will rise from your utmost degradation, and stand forth in the image of God, the conscious candidates of immortal life. This gives them a full assurance of their manhood, and stands as an eternal prophecy that they are not always to be slaves. It is part and parcel of human nature. It is

implanted in every human soul, by the finger of God. You cannot eradicate it; and yet, while it remains, your institution cannot be secure.

There are other reasons enough to show that it is not the normal condition of man. Whence this tremulous perturbation of the whole South on this subject? Why this fear that their institution will be overturned by every breath? Why is it that you withhold from these men and women the knowledge of reading and writing? What mean your nightly patrols, that I see your laws provide for? What means this persecution of Northern men who go among you? What is the fear you have of this Helper book, that we have heard so much of? What means this robbery of the mails and censorship of the press through all the South? If slavery is the normal condition, do you fear that the handiwork of God will be overthrown by these frivolous means? No, sir; never. It falsifies the pretence that it is a normal condition of mankind. Society in the North needs no such artificial props as these to sustain it. You may come up there; you may attack our institutions; we will invite you, wherever you please to come, to preach the glories of slavery as the normal condition of man, and our institutions will stand firmer than ever by the conflict. We fear no such thing. Why? Because, although the Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTER] said that slavery was the normal condition, and, if I understood him, that freedom was an experiment yet, and likely to come out second best, nevertheless everything around you shows the security of the North. The perfect contentedness of the North shows which is the normal and which the other condition. Look to the great Northwest, to which I belong. There is a white population to-day, northwest of the river Ohio, as great as that of all your slave States, so secure, so impassive, so conscious of their own strength, that they are an empire in themselves. I am here day after day, and my constituents ask nothing of me but to be let alone. Here we hear this clamor from the South about Southern rights, day after day, year after year, disturbing elements in our political progress constantly; and yet you hear nothing from the security of freedom and free labor in those regions. All this goes to show that slavery is not the normal condition of man—that it is an institution which has survived the exigencies of the times which permitted it to be established, and now lives on the bare sufferance of mankind.

I have nothing to say of slavery in the States. I do not wish to say, and would not say, a word about it, because I am candid enough to confess that I do not know what you can do with it there. I want no finger with it in your own States. I leave it to yourselves. It is bad enough, to be sure, that four millions of unpaid labor now is operating there, in competition with the free labor of the North; but I have nothing to say of that. Within your own boundaries, conduct it in your own way; but it is wrong. Your new philosophy cannot stand the scrutiny of the present age. It is a departure from the views and principles of your fathers; yea, it is founded in the selfishness and cupidity of man, and not in the justice of God. There is the difficulty with your institution. There is what makes you fear that it may, sooner or later, be overturned; but, sir, I shall do nothing to overturn it. If I could do it with the wave of my hand in your States, I should not know how to do it, or what you should do. All I say is, that, in the vast Territories of this nation, I will allow no such curse to have a foothold. If I am right, and slavery stands branded and condemned by the God of nature, then, for Heaven's sake, go with me to limit it, and not propagate this curse. I am candid enough to admit that you gentlemen on the other side, if you ever become convinced, as I doubt not you will, that this institution does not stand by the rights of nature nor by the will of God, you yourselves will be willing to put a limit to it. You have only departed because your philosophy has led you away. Sir, I leave you with the argument.

And now, Mr. President, in conclusion, I would ask Senators what they find in the Republican party that is so repulsive to them that they must lay hold of the pillars of this Union, and demolish and destroy the noblest Government that has ever existed among men? For what? Not certainly for any evil we have done; for, as I said to start with, you are more prosperous now than you ever were before. What are our principles? Our principles are only these: we hold that you shall limit slavery. Believing it wrong, believing it inconsistent with the best interests of the people, we demand that it shall be limited; and this limita-

tion is not hard upon you, because you have land enough for a population as large as Europe, and century after century must roll away before you can occupy what you now have. The next thing which we hold, and which I have not time to discuss, is the great principle of the homestead bill—a measure that will be up, I trust, this session, and which I shall ask to press through, as the greatest measure I know of to mould in the right direction the Territories belonging to this nation; to build up a free yeomanry capable of maintaining an independent republican Government forever. We demand, also, that there shall be a protection to our own labor against the pauper labor of Europe. We have always contended for it, but you have always stricken it down.

These are the measures, and these are the only measures, I know of that the great Republican party now stand forth as the advocates of. Is there anything repulsive or wrong about them? You may not agree to them; you may differ as to our views; but is there anything in them that should make traitors of us, that should lead a man to pull down the pillars of his Government, and bury it up, in case we succeed? Sir, these principles for which we contend are as old as the Government itself. They stand upon the very foundation of those who framed your Constitution. They are rational and right; they are the concessions that ought to be made to Northern labor against you, who have monopolized four millions of compulsory labor and uncompensated labor, in competition with us.

There is one thing more that I will say before I sit down; but what I am now about to propose is not part and parcel of the Republican platform, that I know of. There is in these United States a race of men who are poor, weak, uninfluential, incapable of taking care of themselves. I mean the free negroes, who are despised by all, repudiated by all; outcasts upon the face of the earth, without any fault of theirs, that I know of; but they are the victims of a deep-rooted prejudice, and I do not stand here to argue whether that prejudice be right or wrong. I know such to be the fact. It is there immovable. It is perfectly impossible that these two races can inhabit the same place, and be prosperous and happy. I see that this species of population are just as abhorrent to the Southern States, and perhaps more so, than to the North; many of those States are now, as I think, passing most unjust laws to drive these men off or to subject them to slavery; they are flocking into the free States, and we have objections to them. Now, the proposition is, that this great Government owes it to justice, owes it to those individuals, owes it to itself and to the free white population of the nation, to provide a means whereby this class of unfortunate men may emigrate to some congenial clime, where they may be maintained, to the mutual benefit of all, both white and black. This will insure a separation of the races. Let them go into the tropics. There, I understand, are vast tracts of the most fertile and inviting land, in a climate perfectly congenial to that class of men, where the negro will be predominant; where his nature seems to be improved, and all his faculties, both mental and physical, are fully developed, and where the white man degenerates in the same proportion as the black man prospers. Let them go there; let them be separated; it is easy to do it. I understand that negotiations may easily be effected with many of the Central American States, by which they will take these people, and confer upon them homesteads, confer upon them great privileges, if they will settle there. They are so easy of access that, a nucleus being formed, they will go of themselves and relieve us of the burden. They will be so far removed from us that they cannot form a disturbing element in our political economy. The far-reaching sagacity of Thomas Jefferson and others suggested this plan. Nobody that I know of has found a better. I understand, too, that in these regions, to which I would let them go, there is no prejudice against them. All colors seem there to live in common, and they would be glad that these men should go among them.

I say that I hope this great principle will be engrafted into our platform as a fundamental article of our faith, for I hold that the Government that fails to defend and secure any such dependent class of freemen in the possession of life, liberty, and happiness, is to that extent a tyranny and despotism. I hope, after that is done, to hear no more about negro equality or anything of that kind. Sir, we shall be as glad to rid ourselves of these people, if we can do it consistently with justice, as anybody else can. We will not, however, perpetrate injustice against them. We will not drive them out, but we will use every inducement to per-

suade these unfortunate men to find a home there, so as to separate the races, and all will go better than it can under any other system that we can devise. I say again, I hope that the demands of justice and good policy will be complied with; and by the consent of all, this will be done; and if it is not done with the assent of all, I do hope it will be part and parcel of the great Republican platform; for I think it consists with right, with justice, and with a proper regard for the welfare of these unfortunate men.

LETTER OF HON. JAMES O. PUTNAM.

The following Letter is from one of the most intelligent and influential members of the American Party—late a distinguished Senator of this State, and the American candidate for Secretary of State in 1857:

FREDONIA, July 13, 1860.

GENTLEMEN: Engagements already made for the ensuing week prevent my acceptance of your invitation to attend and address a mass meeting at Union Park on the 16th inst. of citizens, irrespective of party, who believe that the prosperity of our Union will be advanced by the election of Lincoln to the Presidency.

You say it is to be more particularly under the auspices of gentlemen, "many of whom have heretofore supported Henry Clay and Millard Fillmore, and are not now connected with any political organization."

To meet with and confer with those who have always acted as I have, with the conservative school, prepared to follow where duty and patriotism lead, whether under a Clay, a Fillmore or a Lincoln, or whomsoever the time shall designate, would afford me great pleasure.

You will allow me to refer briefly to our past political history.

The friends of Mr. Clay, who sustained the Compromise measures of 1850, naturally yielded their support to Mr. Fillmore in 1856, whose administration was distinguished for its fidelity to those measures. Not that they necessarily preferred the disposition made of that series of questions to some other, had such other been possible, but they accepted them as, under the circumstances, best calculated to give repose to a distracted country. They believed it was best to give and take—to win peace among brethren by concession, rather than to force it by conquest.

We saw the storm of opposition to that settlement fast yielding to the general conviction that, on the whole, it was wisest and best, and the country congratulated itself on a "final settlement" of the Slavery question.

In an evil hour, Stephen A. Douglas opened the question afresh, and plunged us into that sea of troubles in which we have been wandering, rayless and pathless, and at times hopeless, for the past six years. The Missouri Compromise, the great achievement of Mr. Clay's life—a compact which had all the sacredness of a constitutional obligation—a compact cherished in the hearts of twenty millions of American citizens as a new charter of humanity—was trodden under foot as a worthless thing, and civil war invoked to settle anew the question of free or servile labor in the Territories.

And now the author of all this harvest of mischief asks a grateful country to reward him with the highest trust in its gift!

"Conservative" men must find positions in some of the organizations which now ask their alliance, and there is a wide latitude for choice. I know nothing in the Republican party which turns a "Conservative," whether he be such from temperament or education, into an Abolitionist, a Disunionist, or a hater of his brethren. "Friends of Mr. Clay and Mr. Fillmore," to use the language of your letter, have never had much sympathy with any branch of the Democratic party. They saw it calumniate Mr. Clay down to the grave from the time of the election in 1824. He was ever the target for all their hunters, and he went into his grave covered with their poisoned arrows. He was hardly at rest in his tomb before it undid the most glorious act of his life.

From my stand-point, I cannot see how any

friend of Mr. Clay can vote for either of the Democratic candidates.

Where then shall we go? Two paths are open before us. We can support Mr. Lincoln, and seek to inaugurate a Republican policy in the Government, under his auspices, or we can support Mr. Bell. Now, gentlemen, I yield my unqualified assent to every eulogium that has been pronounced on Mr. Bell and Mr. Everett. Their names are synonyms of every public and private virtue. The republic has no worthier men. But this fact stares us in the face: In them, able and worthy as they are, the hour and the men for success do not meet. Nobody believes, no sane or insane man pretends, that in the State of New York they can command a tenth of the popular vote. A vote for them in any Northern State is a vote thrown away. If I lived in a Southern State, where a Lincoln ticket is not in the field, I would give my best energies to the Baltimore Union ticket. And if a Lincoln ticket were in the field, but only nominally so, where to support it would be practical neutrality in the contest, then I would vote for Bell and Everett, as the best thing I could do to defeat the Democracy, and as eminently fitting and proper in itself.

But here we can do an efficient, and a fitting and proper service, only by a support of Lincoln. And yet, strange to say, there are men, once "friends of Clay and Fillmore," who advise a support of Douglas, if necessary to defeat Lincoln in New York—not to do Douglas any service, but to defeat an election by the College, and throw it into Congress.

The friends of Breckenridge are looking to the same result to take the election over the House to the Senate, where less than fifty men may make a President of Lane for thirty millions.

All interests are proposing to make a common fight against Lincoln, that the Presidency may be scrambled for in the Congressional ring.

If our "Union" friends shall succeed, and catch a President in Lane by their pains, they will learn by experience a lesson I will learn at a cheaper rate.

Now, let me ask, why should we not vote for Lincoln, and sustain the Republican policy? First—What is that policy in regard to the leading issue of the day? This and nothing more, as I understand it: To preserve to freedom Territories now free. In other words, to adhere to the principles of Mr. Clay, as declared by him in his memorable speech in 1850. It makes no retrograde movement in all that pertains to human progress. It does not propose to interfere with Slavery in the States, but the contrary. It has some Abolitionists in its body—so had the old Whig party. But it is no more an Abolition party, and from the strong conservative element in it, can no more become so than can the Baltimore Union party. Every liberal-minded man knows this. If it is sectional, because its ticket is made from the North, and its main support is in the North, the responsibility of this lies at the door of the Democratic party, for it has established a reign of terror all over the South which renders it unsafe for men to co-operate with the organization.

Now who, and what, is Mr. Lincoln, that Conservative men should shrink from him as from contagion? I have read him carefully, and have not been able to find a sentiment in all his frank, unreserved discussions, which does not accord with what Mr. Clay has uttered over and over again. He is opposed to making free territory slave. So was Mr. Clay. He looks hopefully to the extinction of the institution, and the substitution of a more humane and just relation of labor to capital, and that by the parties interested, and in lawful and proper ways. So did Mr. Clay. He is no fanatic, bawling after equal social and political rights for the negro with the white race. Read his debate with Senator Douglas for the most sound and common sense views on all this class of questions. He does believe the negro to be a man, and not a thing, and that the broad humanity of our Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as the free gift of God, is a universal principle as good at the tropics as in the temperate latitudes. Did Mr. Clay think otherwise? I see nothing in Mr. Lincoln's political character which repels from his support.

In his personal character I find much that is attractive. It is the universal testimony, it comes from political foe and friend alike, who know him, that he has kept his heart sound in all his life-battle. So pre-eminent is his integrity, so deep-rooted is his justice in public confidence, that his familiar appellation is a *sobriquet* indicative of that confidence.

Few men win this in any country. Aristides did, and he was banished from his country because he was "honest."

We are not immaculate, but I do not believe we are yet prepared to banish our Aristides because he is called "the Just."

Very respectfully,

JAMES O. PUTNAM.

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS.—No. 10.

The Barbarism of Slavery.

MR. MADISON THOUGHT IT **WRONG** TO ADMIT IN THE CONSTITUTION THE IDEA OF PROPERTY IN MEN.—*Debates in the Federal Convention, 25th August,* 1787.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES SUMNER,

ON THE

Bill for the Admission of Kansas as a Free State.

In the United States Senate, June 4, 1860.

Mr. President: Undertaking now, after a silence of more than four years, to address the Senate on this important subject, I should suppress the emotions natural to such an occasion, if I did not declare on the threshold my gratitude to that Supreme Being, through whose benign care I am enabled, after much suffering and many changes, once again to resume my duties here, and to speak for the cause which is so near my heart. To the honored Commonwealth whose representative I am, and also to my immediate associates in this body, with whom I enjoy the fellowship which is found *in thinking alike concerning the Republic,* I owe thanks which I seize this moment to express for the indulgence shown me throughout the protracted seclusion enjoined by medical skill; and I trust that it will not be thought unbecoming in me to put on record here, as an apology for leaving my seat so long vacant, without making way, by resignation, for a successor, that I acted under the illusion of an invalid, whose hopes for restoration to his natural health constantly triumphed over his disappointments.

When last I entered into this debate, it became my duty to expose the Crime against Kansas, and to insist upon the immediate admission of that Territory as a State of this Union, with a Constitution forbidding Slavery. Time has passed; but the question remains. Resuming the discussion precisely where I left it, I am happy to avow that rule of moderation, which, it is said, may venture even to fix the boundaries of wisdom itself. I have no personal griefs to utter; only a barbarous egotism could intrude these into this chamber. I have no personal wrongs to avenge; only a barbarous nature could attempt to wield that vengeance which belongs to the Lord. The years that have intervened and the tombs that have been opened since I spoke have their voices too, which I cannot fail to hear. Besides, what am I—what is any man among the living or among the dead, compared with the Question before us? It is this alone which I shall discuss, and I open the argument with that easy victory which is found in charity.

The Crime against Kansas stands forth in painful light. Search history, and you cannot find its parallel. The slave-trade is bad; but even this enormity is petty, compared with that elaborate contrivance by which, in a Christian age and within the limits of a Republic, all forms of constitutional liberty were perverted; by which all the rights of human nature were violated, and the whole country was held trembling on the edge of civil war; while all this large exuberance of wickedness, detestable in itself, becomes tenfold more detestable when its origin is traced to the madness for Slavery. The fatal partition between Freedom and Slavery, known as the Missouri Compromise; the subsequent overthrow of this partition, and the seizure of all by Slavery; the violation of plighted faith; the conspiracy to force Slavery at all hazards into Kansas; the successive invasions by which all security there was destroyed, and the electoral franchise itself was trodden down; the sacrilegious seizure of the very polls, and, through pretended forms of law, the imposition of a foreign legislature upon this Territory; the acts of this legislature, fortifying the Usurpation, and, among other things, establishing test-oaths, calculated to disfranchise actual settlers, friendly to Freedom, and securing the privileges of the citizen to actual

☞For Sale at the Office of the Albany Evening Journal. Price, per Single Copy, 2c.; per Dozen Copies, 20c.; per Hundred, $1; per Thousand, $8.

strangers friendly to Slavery; the whole crowned by a statute—"the be-all and the end-all" of the whole Usurpation—through which Slavery was not only recognized on this beautiful soil, but made to bristle with a Code of Death such as the world has rarely seen; all these I have fully exposed on a former occasion. And yet the most important part of the argument was at that time left untouched; I mean that which is found in Character of Slavery. This natural sequel, with the permission of the Senate, I propose now to supply.

Motive is to Crime as soul to body; and it is only when we comprehend the motive that we can truly comprehend the Crime. Here, the motive is found in Slavery and the rage for its extension. Therefore, by logical necessity, must Slavery be discussed; not indirectly, timidly, and sparingly, but directly, openly, and thoroughly. It must be exhibited as it is; alike in its influence and in its animating character, so that not only its outside but its inside may be seen.

This is no time for soft words or excuses. All such are out of place. They may turn away wrath; but what is the wrath of man? This is no time to abandon any advantage in the argument. Senators sometimes announce that they resist Slavery on political grounds only, and remind us that they say nothing of the moral question. This is wrong. Slavery must be resisted not only on political grounds; but on all other grounds, whether social, economical, or moral. Ours is no holiday contest; nor is it any strife of rival factions; of White and Red Roses; of theatric Neri and Bianchi; but it is a solemn battle between Right and Wrong; between Good and Evil. Such a battle cannot be fought with excuses or with rose-water. There is austere work to be done, and Freedom cannot consent to fling away any of her weapons.

If I were disposed to shrink from this discussion, the boundless assumptions now made by Senators on the other side would not allow me. The whole character of Slavery as a pretended form of civilization is put directly in issue, with a pertinacity and a hardihood which banish all reserve on this side. In these assumptions, Senators from South Carolina naturally take the lead. Following Mr. Calhoun, who pronounced "Slavery the most safe and stable basis for free institutions in the world," and Mr. McDuffie, who did not shrink from calling it "the corner-stone of the republican edifice," the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMMOND] insists that "its forms of society are the best in the world;" and his colleague [Mr. CHESNUT] takes up the strain. One Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DAVIS] adds, that Slavery "is but a form of civil government for those who are not fit to govern themselves;" and his colleague [Mr. BROWN] openly vaunts that it "is a great moral, social, and political blessing—a blessing to the slave and a blessing to the master." One Senator from Virginia, [Mr. HUNTER,] in a studied vindication of what he is pleased to call "the social system of the slave-holding States," exalts Slavery as "the normal condition of human society;" "beneficial to the non-slave-owner as it is to the slave-owner"—"best for the happiness of both races;" and, in enthusiastic advocacy, declares, "that the very keystone of the mighty arch, which by its concentrated strength is able to sustain our social superstructure, consists in the black marble block of African slavery. Knock that out," he says, "and the mighty fabric, with all that it upholds, topples and tumbles to its fall." These were his very words, uttered in debate here. And his colleague, [Mr. MASON,] who has never hesitated where Slavery was in question, has proclaimed that it is "*ennobling* to both master and slave"—a word which, so far as the slave was concerned, he changed, on a subsequent day, to "elevating," assuming still that it is "ennobling" to the master—which is simply a new version of an old assumption, by Mr. McDuffie, of South Carolina, that "Slavery supersedes the necessity of an order of nobility."

Thus, by various voices, is the claim made for Slavery, which is put forward defiantly as a form of civilization—as if its existence were not plainly inconsistent with the first principles of anything that can be called Civilization—except by that figure of speech in classical literature, where a thing takes its name from something which it has not, as the dreadful Fates were called merciful because they were without mercy. And pardon the allusion, if I add, that, listening to these sounding words for Slavery, I am reminded of the kindred extravagance related by that remarkable traveler in China, the late Abbe Huc, of a gloomy hole in which he was lodged, pestered by mosquitoes and exhaling noisome vapors, where light and air entered only by a single narrow aperture, but styled by Chinese pride the Hotel of the Beatitudes.

It is natural that Senators thus insensible to the true character of Slavery, should evince an equal insensibility to the true character of the Constitution. This is shown in the claim now made, and pressed with unprecedented energy, degrading the work of our fathers, that by virtue of the Constitution, the pretended property in man is placed beyond the reach of Congressional prohibition even within Congressional jurisdiction, so that the Slave-master may at all times enter the broad outlying Territories of the Union with the victims of his oppression, and there continue to hold them by lash and chain.

Such are the two assumptions, the *first* an assumption of fact, and the *second* an assumption of constitutional law, which are now made without apology or hesitation. I meet them both. To the first I oppose the essential Barbarism of Slavery, in all its influences, whether high or low, as Satan is Satan still, whether towering in the sky or squatting in the toad. To the second I oppose the unanswerable, irresistible truth, that the Constitution of the United States nowhere recognises property in man. These two assumptions naturally go together. They are "twins" suckled by the same wolf. They are the "couple" in the present slave hunt. And the latter cannot be answered without exposing the former. It is only when Slavery is exhibited in its truly hateful character, that we can fully appreciate the absurdity of the assumption, which, in defiance of the express letter of the Constitution, and without a single sentence, phrase, or word, upholding human bondage, yet foists into this blameless text the barbarous idea that man can hold property in man.

On former occasions, I have discussed Slavery only incidentally; as, in unfolding the principle that Slavery is Sectional and Freedom National; in exposing the unconstitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Bill; in vindicating the Prohibition of

Slavery in the Missouri Territory; in exhibiting the imbecility throughout the Revolution of the Slave States, and especially of South Carolina; and lastly, in unmasking the Crime against Kansas. On all these occasions, where I have spoken at length, I have said too little of the character of Slavery, partly because other topics were presented, and partly from a disinclination which I have always felt to press the argument against those whom I knew to have all the sensitiveness of a sick man. But, God be praised, this time has passed, and the debate is now lifted from details to principles. Grander debate has not occurred in our history; rarely in any history; nor can this debate close or subside except with the triumph of Freedom.

First Assumption.—Of course I begin with the assumption of fact.

It was the often-quoted remark of John Wesley, who knew well how to use words, as also how to touch hearts, that Slavery was "the sum of all villainies." The phrase is pungent; but it would be rash in any of us to criticize the testimony of that illustrious founder of Methodism, whose ample experience of Slavery in Georgia and the Carolinas seems to have been all condensed in this sententious judgment. Language is feeble to express all the enormity of this institution, which is now vaunted as in itself a form of civilization, "ennobling" at least to the master, if not to the slave. Look at it in whatever light you will, and it is always the scab, the canker, the "bare-bones," and the shame of the country; wrong, not merely in the abstract, as is often admitted by its apologists, but wrong in the concrete also, and possessing no single element of right. Look at it in the light of principles, and it is nothing less than a huge insurrection against the eternal law of God, involving in its pretensions the denial of all human rights, and also the denial of that Divine Law in which God himself is manifest, thus being practically the grossest lie and the grossest Atheism. Founded in violence, sustained only by violence, such a wrong must by a sure law of compensation blast the master as well as the slave; blast the lands on which they live; blast the community of which they are a part; blast the Government which does not forbid the outrage; and the longer it exists and the more completely it prevails, must its blasting influences penetrate the whole social system. Barbarous in origin; barbarous in its law; barbarous in all its pretensions; barbarous in the instruments it employs; barbarous in consequences; barbarous in spirit; barbarous wherever it shows itself, Slavery must breed Barbarians, while it develops everywhere, alike in the individual and in the society to which he belongs, the essential elements of Barbarism. In this character it is now conspicuous before the world.

In undertaking now to expose the Barbarism of Slavery, the whole broad field is open before me. There is nothing in its character, its manifold wrong, its wretched results, and especially in its influence on the class who claim to be "ennobled" by it, that will not fall naturally under consideration.

I know well the difficulty of this discussion involved in the humiliating Truth with which I begin. Senators on former occasions, revealing their sensibility, have even protested against any comparison between what were called the "two civilizations," meaning the two social systems produced respectively by Freedom and by Slavery. The sensibility and the protest are not unnatural, though mistaken. "Two civilizations!" Sir, in this nineteenth century of Christian light, there can be but one Civilization, and this is where Freedom prevails. Between Slavery and Civilization there is an essential incompatibility. If you are for the one, you cannot be for the other; and just in proportion to the embrace of Slavery is the divorce from Civilization. That Slave-masters should be disturbed when this is exposed, might be expected. But the assumptions now so boastfully made, while they may not prevent the sensibility, yet surely exclude all ground of protest when these assumptions are exposed.

Nor is this the only difficulty Slavery is a bloody Touch-me-not, and everywhere in sight now blooms the bloody flower. It is on the way side as we approach the national capital; it is on the marble steps which we mount; it flaunts on this floor. I stand now in the house of its friends. About me while I speak are its most sensitive guardians, who have shown in the past how much they are ready either to do or not to do where Slavery is in question. Menaces to deter me have not been spared. But I should ill deserve this high post of duty here, with which I have been honored by a generous and enlightened people, if I could hesitate. Idolatry has been often exposed in the presence of idolaters, and hypocrisy has been chastised in the presence of Scribes and Pharisees. Such examples may give encouragement to a Senator who undertakes in this presence to expose Slavery; nor can any language, directly responsive to the assumptions now made for this Barbarism, be open to question. Slavery can only be painted in the sternest colors; but I cannot forget that nature's sternest painter has been called the best.

The Barbarism of Slavery appears; *first* in the *character of Slavery*, and *secondly* in the *character of Slave-masters*. Under the first head we shall naturally consider (1) the Law of Slavery and its Origin, and (2) the practical results of Slavery as shown in a comparison between the Free States and the Slave States. Under the *second* head we shall naturally consider (1) Slave-masters as shown in the Law of Slavery; (2) Slave-masters in their relations with slaves, here glancing at their three brutal instruments; and (3) Slave-masters in their relations with each other, with society, and with Government; and (4) Slave-masters in their unconsciousness.

The way will then be prepared for the consideration of the assumption of constitutional law.

I. In presenting the Character of Slavery, there is little for me to do, except to allow Slavery to paint itself. When this is done, the picture will need no explanatory words.

(1.) I begin with the *Law of Slavery and its Origin*, and here this Barbarism paints itself in its own chosen definition. It is simply this: Man, created in the image of God, is divested of his human character, and declared to be a "chattel"—that is, a beast, a thing or article of property. That this statement may not seem to be put forward without precise authority, I quote

the statutes of three different States, beginning with South Carolina, whose voice for Slavery always has an unerring distinctiveness. Here is the definition supplied by this State:

"Slaves shall be deemed, held, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law, to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their owners and possessors and their executors, administrators, and assigns, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever."—2 *Brev. Dig.*, 229.

And here is the definition supplied by the Civil Code of Louisiana:

"A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, and his labor. He can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything, but what must belong to his master."—*Civil Code, art.* 35.

In similar spirit, the law of Maryland thus indirectly defines a slave as an *article:*

"In case the personal property of a ward shall consist of specific *articles, such as slaves,* working beasts, animals of any kind, the court, if it deem it advantageous for the ward, may at any time pass an order for the sale thereof."—*Statutes of Maryland.*

Not to occupy time unnecessarily, I present a summary of the pretended law defining Slavery in all the Slave States, as made by a careful writer, Judge Stroud, in a work of judicial as well as philanthropic merit:

"The cardinal principle of Slavery—that the slave is not to be ranked among *sentient* beings, but among *things*—is an article of property—a chattel personal—obtains as undoubted law in all of these [Slave] States."—*Stroud's Law of Slavery, p.* 22.

Out of this definition, as from a solitary germ, which in its pettiness might be crushed by the hand, towers our Upas Tree and all its gigantic poison. Study it, and you will comprehend the whole monstrous growth.

Sir, look at its plain import, and see the relation which it establishes. The slave is held simply *for the use of his master*, to whose behests, his life, liberty, and happiness, are devoted, and by whom he may be bartered, leased, mortgaged, bequeathed, invoiced, shipped as cargo, stored as goods, sold on execution, knocked off at public auction, and even staked at the gaming table on the hazard of a card or a die; all according to law. Nor is there anything, within the limit of life, inflicted on a beast which may not be inflicted on the slave. He may be marked like a hog, branded like a mule, yoked like an ox, hobbled like a horse, driven like an ass, sheared like a sheep, maimed like a cur, and constantly beaten like a brute; all according to law. And should life itself be taken, what is the remedy? The Law of Slavery, imitating that rule of evidence which, in barbarous days and barbarous countries, prevented a Christian from testifying against a Mahomedan, openly pronounces the incompetency of the whole African race—whether bond or free—to testify in any case against a white man, and, thus having already surrendered the slave to all possible outrage, crowns its tyranny, by excluding the very testimony through which the bloody cruelty of the Slave-master might be exposed.

Thus in its Law does Slavery paint itself; but it is only when we look at details, and detect its essential elements—*five in number*—all inspired by a *single motive*, that its character becomes completely manifest.

Foremost, of course, in these elements, is the impossible pretension, where Barbarism is lost in impiety, by which man claims *property in man.* Against such arrogance the argument is brief. According to the law of nature, written by the same hand that placed the planets in their orbits, and like them, constituting a part of the eternal system of the Universe, every human being has a complete title to himself direct from the Almighty. Naked he is born; but this birthright is inseparable from the human form. A man may be poor in this world's goods; but he owns himself. No war or robbery, ancient or recent; no capture; no middle passage; no change of clime; no purchase money; no transmission from hand to hand, no matter how many times, and no matter at what price, can defeat this indefeasible God-given franchise. And a Divine mandate, strong as that which guards Life, guards Liberty also. Even at the very morning of Creation, when God said, let there be light—earlier than the malediction against murder—He set an everlasting difference between man and a chattel, giving to man dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth:

> —— that right we hold
> By His donation; but man over men
> He made not lord, such title to Himself
> Reserving, human left from human free.

Slavery tyrannically assumes a power which Heaven denied, while, under its barbarous necromancy, borrowed from the Source of Evil, a man is changed into a chattel—a person is withered into a thing—a soul is shrunk into merchandise. Say, sir, in your madness, that you own the sun, the stars, the moon; but do not say that you own a man, endowed with a soul that shall live immortal, when sun and moon and stars have passed away.

Secondly. Slavery paints itself again in its complete *abrogation of marriage*, recognised as a sacrament by the church, and recognised as a contract wherever civilization prevails. Under the law of Slavery, no such sacrament is respected, and no such contract can exist. The ties that may be formed between slaves are all subject to the selfish interests or more selfish lust of the master, whose license knows no check. Natural affections which have come together are rudely torn asunder; nor is this all. Stripped of every defence, the chastity of a whole race is exposed to violence, while the result is recorded in the tell-tale faces of children, glowing with their master's blood, but doomed for their mother's skin to Slavery, through all descending generations. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Brown] is galled by the comparison between Slavery and Polygamy, and winces. I hail this sensibility as the sign of virtue. Let him reflect, and he will confess, that there are many disgusting elements in Slavery, which are not present in Polygamy, while the single disgusting element of Polygamy is more than present in Slavery. By the license of Polygamy, one may have many wives, all bound to him by the marriage tie, and in other respects protected by law. By the license of Slavery, a whole race is delivered over to prostitution and concubinage, without the protection of any law. Sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

Thirdly. Slavery paints itself again in its complete *abrogation of the parental relation*, which God in his benevolence has provided for the nurture and education of the human family,

and which constitutes an essential part of Civilization itself. And yet, by the law of Slavery—happily beginning to be modified in some places—this relation is set at naught, and in its place is substituted the arbitrary control of the master, at whose mere command little children, such as the Saviour called unto him, though clasped by a mother's arms, may be swept under the hammer of the auctioneer. I do not dwell on this exhibition. Sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

Fourthly. Slavery paints itself again *in closing the gates of knowledge*, which are also the shining gates of civilization. Under its plain unequivocal law, the bondman may, at the unrestrained will of his master, be shut out from all instruction, while in many places, incredible to relate! the law itself, by cumulative provisions, positively forbids that he shall be taught to read. Of course, the slave cannot be allowed to read, for his soul would then expand in larger air, while he saw the glory of the North Star, and also the helping truth, that God, who made iron, never made a slave; for he would then become familiar with the Scriptures, with the Decalogue still speaking in the thunders of Sinai; with that ancient text, "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hands, he shall surely be put to death;" with that other text, "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal;" with that great story of redemption, when the Lord raised the slave-born Moses to deliver his chosen people from the house of bondage; and with that sublimer story, where the Saviour died a cruel death, that all men, without distinction of race, might be saved—leaving to mankind commandments, which, even without his example, make Slavery impossible. Thus, in order to fasten your manacles upon the slave, you fasten other manacles upon his soul. Sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

Fifthly. Slavery paints itself again *in the appropriation of all the toil* of its victims, excluding them from that property in their own earnings, which the law of nature allows, and civilization secures. The painful injustice of this pretension is lost in its meanness. It is robbery and petty larceny under the garb of law. And even its meanness is lost in the absurdity of its associate pretension, that the African, thus despoiled of all his earnings, is saved from poverty, and that for his own good he must work for his master, and not for himself. Alas! by such a fallacy, is a whole race pauperized! And yet this transaction is not without illustrative example. A solemn poet, whose verse has found wide favor, pictures a creature who,

> ——— With one hand put
> A penny in the urn of poverty,
> And with the other took a shilling out.
> *Pollok's "Course of Time," Book VIII, 632.*

And a celebrated traveller through Russia, more than a generation ago, describes a kindred spirit, who, while on his knees before an altar of the Greek Church, devoutly told his beads with one hand, and with the other deliberately picked the pocket of a fellow-sinner by his side. Not admiring these instances, I cannot cease to deplore a system which has much of both, while, under an affectation of charity, it sordidly takes from the slave all the fruits of his bitter sweat, and thus takes from him the mainspring to exertion. Tell me, sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

Such is Slavery in its five special elements of Barbarism, as recognised by law; first, assuming that man can hold property in man; secondly, abrogating the relation of husband and wife; thirdly, abrogating the parental tie; fourthly, closing the gates of knowledge; and fifthly, appropriating the unpaid labor of another. Take away these elements, sometimes called "abuses," and Slavery will cease to exist, for it is these very "abuses" which constitute Slavery. Take away any one of them, and the abolition of Slavery begins. And when I present Slavery for judgment, I mean no slight evil, with regard to which there may be a reasonable difference of opinion, but I mean this five-fold embodiment of "abuse"—this ghastly quincunx of Barbarism—each particular of which, if considered separately, must be denounced at once with all the ardor of an honest soul, while the whole five-fold combination must awake a five-fold denunciation.

But this five-fold combination becomes still more hateful when its *single motive* is considered. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DAVIS] says that it is "but a form of civil government for those who are not fit to govern themselves." The Senator is mistaken. It is an outrage where five different pretensions all concur in one single object, looking only to the profit of the master, and constituting its ever-present motive power, which is simply to *compel the labor of fellow-men without wages!*

If the offence of Slavery were less extended; if it were confined to some narrow region; if it had less of grandeur in its proportions; if its victims were counted by tens and hundreds, instead of millions, the five-headed enormity would find little indulgence. All would rise against it, while religion and civilization would lavish their choicest efforts in the general warfare. But what is wrong when done to one man cannot be right when done to many. If it is wrong thus to degrade a single soul—if it is wrong thus to degrade you, Mr. President—it cannot be right to degrade a whole race. And yet this is denied by the barbarous logic of Slavery, which, taking advantage of its own wrong, claims immunity because its Usurpation has assumed a front of audacity that cannot be safely attacked. Unhappily, there is Barbarism elsewhere in the world; but American Slavery, as defined by existing law, stands forth as the greatest organized Barbarism on which the sun now shines. It is without a single peer. Its author, after making it, broke the die.

If curiosity carries us to the origin of this law—and here I approach a topic often considered in this Chamber—we shall confess again its Barbarism. It is not derived from the common law, that fountain of Liberty; for this law, while unhappily recognising a system of servitude, known as villeinage, secured to the bondman privileges unknown to the American slave; protected his person against mayhem; protected his wife against rape; gave to his marriage equal validity with the marriage of his master, and surrounded his offspring with generous presumptions of Freedom, unlike that rule of yours by which the servitude of the mother is necessarily stamped upon the child. It is not derived from the Roman law, that fountain of tyranny, for two reasons—first, because this law, in its better days, when its early rigors were spent—like the common law itself—secured to the bondman privileges unknown to the American slave—in certain

cases of cruelty rescued him from his master—prevented the separation of parents and children, also of brothers and sisters—and even protected him in the marriage relation; and secondly, because the Thirteen Colonies were not driven from any of those countries which recognised the Roman law, while this law, even before the discovery of this continent, had lost all living efficacy. It is not derived from the Mahomedan law; for under the mild injunctions of the Koran, a benignant servitude, unlike yours, has prevailed—where the lash is not allowed to lacerate the back of a female; where no knife or branding-iron is employed upon any human being to mark him as the property of his fellow-man; where the master is expressly enjoined to listen to the desires of his slave for emancipation; and where the blood of the master, mingling with his bondwoman, takes from her the transferable character of a chattel, and confers complete freedom upon their offspring. It is not derived from the Spanish law; for this law contains humane elements, unknown to your system, borrowed, perhaps, from the Mahomedan Moors who so long occupied Spain; and, besides, our Thirteen Colonies had no umbilical connection with Spain. Nor is it derived from English statutes or American statutes; for we have the positive and repeated averment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Mason], and also of other Senators, that in not a single State of the Union can any such statutes establishing Slavery be found. From none of these does it come.

No, sir; not from any land of civilization is this Barbarism derived. It comes from Africa; ancient nurse of monsters; from Guinea, Dahomey, and Congo. There is its origin and fountain. This benighted region, we are told by Chief Justice Marshall in a memorable judgment, (*The Antelope*, 10 Wheaton R., 66,) still asserts a right, discarded by Christendom, to enslave captives taken in war; and this African Barbarism is the beginning of American Slavery. And the Supreme Court of Georgia, a Slave State, has not shrunk from this conclusion. "Licensed to hold slave property," says the Court, "the Georgia planter held the slave as a chattel; either directly from the slave-trader, or from those who held under him, and he from the slave-captor in Africa. The property of the planter in the slave became thus, the property of the original captor." (*Neal* v. *Farmer*, 9 *Georgia Reports*, *p.* 555.) It is natural that a right, thus derived in defiance of Christendom, and openly founded on the most vulgar Paganism, should be exercised without any mitigating influence from Christianity; that the master's authority over the person of his slave—over his conjugal relations—over his parental relations—over the employment of his time—over all his acquisitions, should be recognised, while no generous presumption inclines to Freedom, and the womb of the bond-woman can deliver only a slave.

From its home in Africa, where it is sustained by immemorial usage, this Barbarism, thus derived and thus developed, traversed the ocean to American soil. It entered on board that fatal slave-ship "built in the eclipse, and rigged with curses dark," which in 1620 landed its cruel cargo at Jamestown, in Virginia, and it has boldly taken its place in every succeeding slave-ship from that early day till now—helping to pack the human freight, regardless of human agony; surviving the torments of the middle passage; surviving its countless victims plunged beneath the waves; and it has left the slave-ship only to travel inseparable from the slave in his various doom, sanctioning by its barbarous code every outrage whether of mayhem or robbery, of lash or lust, and fastening itself upon his offspring to the remotest generation. Thus are the barbarous prerogatives of barbarous half-naked African chiefs perpetuated in American slave-masters, while the Senator from Virginia, [Mr. Mason,] perhaps unconscious of their origin—perhaps desirous to secure for them the appearance of a less barbarous pedigree—tricks them out with a phrase of the Roman law, discarded by the common law, *partus sequitur ventrem*, which simply renders into ancient Latin an existing rule of African Barbarism, recognised as an existing rule of American Slavery.

Such is the plain juridical origin of the American slave code, which is now vaunted as a badge of Civilization. But all law, whatever may be its juridical origin, whether English or Mahomedan, Roman or African, may be traced to other and ampler influences in nature, sometimes of Right, and sometimes of Wrong. Surely the law which blasted the slave-trade as piracy punishable with death had a different inspiration from that other law, which secured immunity for the slave-trade throughout an immense territory, and invested its supporters with political power. As there is a higher law above, so there is a lower law below, and each is felt in human affairs.

Thus far, we have seen Slavery only in its pretended law, and in the origin of that law. And here I might stop, without proceeding in this argument; for, on the letter of the law alone Slavery must be condemned. But the tree is known by its fruits, and these I now shall exhibit; and this brings me to the second stage of the argument.

(2.) In considering the *practical results of Slavery*, the materials are so obvious and diversified, that my chief care will be to abridge and reject; and here I shall put the Slave States and Free States face to face, showing at each point the blasting influence of Slavery.

The States where this Barbarism now exists excel the Free States in all natural advantages. Their territory is more extensive, stretching over 851,448 square miles, while the Free States, including California, embrace only 612,597 square miles. Here is a difference of more than 238,000 square miles in favor of the Slave States, showing that Freedom starts in this great controversy, with a field more than a quarter less than that of Slavery. In happiness of climate, adapted to productions of special value; in exhaustless motive power distributed throughout its space; in natural highways, by more than fifty navigable rivers, never closed by the rigors of winter, and in a stretch of coast along ocean and gulf, indented by hospitable harbors—the whole presenting incomparable advantages for that true civilization where agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, both domestic and foreign, blend—in all these respects the Slave States excel the Free States, whose climate is often churlish, whose motive power is less various, whose navigable rivers are fewer and often sealed by ice, and whose coast, while less in extent and with fewer harbors, is often perilous from storm and cold.

But Slavery plays the part of a Harpy, and defiles the choicest banquet. See what it does with this territory, thus spacious and fair.

An important indication of prosperity is to be found in the growth of *population*. In this respect the two regions started equal. In 1790, at the first census under the Constitution, the population of the present Slave States was 1.961,372, of the present Free States 1,968,455, showing a difference of only 7,083 in favor of the Free States. This difference, at first merely nominal, has been constantly increasing since, showing itself more strongly in each decennial census, until, in 1850, the population of the Slave States, swollen by the annexation of three foreign Territories, Louisiana, Florida, and Texas, was only 9,612,769, while that of the Free States, without any such annexations, reached 13,434,922. Showing a difference of 3,822,153 in favor of Freedom. But this difference becomes still more remarkable, if we confine our inquiries to the white population, which, at this period, was only 6,184,477 in the Slave States, while it was 13,238,670 in the Free States, showing a difference of more than 7,054,193 in favor of Freedom, and showing that the white population of the Free States had not only doubled but commenced to triple that of the Slave States, although occupying a smaller territory. The comparative sparseness of the two populations furnishes another illustration. In the Slave States the average number of inhabitants to a square mile was 11.28, while in the Free States it was 21.93, or almost two to one in favor of Freedom.

These results are general; but if we take any particular Slave State, and compare it with a Free State, we shall find the same constant evidence for Freedom. Take Virginia, with a territory of 61,352 miles, and New York, with a territory of 47,000, or over 14,000 square miles less than her sister State. New York has one sea-port, Virginia some three or four; New York has one noble river, Virginia has several; New York for 400 miles runs along the frozen line of Canada; Virginia basks in a climate of constant felicity. But Freedom is better than climate, rivers, or sea-port!

In 1790 the population of Virginia was 748, 308, and in 1850 it was 1,421,C61. In 1790, the population of New York was 340,120, and in 1850 it was 3,097,394; that of Virginia had not doubled in sixty years, while that of New York had multiplied more than nine-fold. A similar comparison may be made between Kentucky, with 37,680 square miles, admitted into the Union as long ago as 1790, and Ohio with 39,964 square miles, admitted into the Union in 1802. In 1850 the Slave State had a population of only 982,405, while Ohio had a population of 1,980,329, showing a difference of nearly a million in favor of Freedom.

As in population, so also in the *value of property, real and personal*, do the Free States excel the Slave States. According to the census of 1850, the value of property in the Free States was $4,107,162,198, while in the Slave States it was $2,936,090,73 7; or, if we deduct the asserted property in human flesh, only $1,655,945, 137—showing an enormous difference of billions in favor of Freedom. In the Free States the valuation per acre was $10.47, in the Slave States only $3.04. This disproportion was still greater in 1855, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury when the valuation of the Free States was $5,770,194,680; or $14.72 per acre; and of the Slave States, $3,977,353, 946, or, if we deduct the asserted property in human flesh $2,505,186,346, or $4.59 per acre. Thus, in five years from 1850, the valuation of property in the Free States received an increase of more than the whole accumulated valuation of the Slave States at that time.

Looking at details, we find the same disproportions. Arkansas and Michigan, equal in territory, were admitted into the Union in the same year; and yet in 1855, the whole valuation of Arkansas, including its asserted property in human flesh, was only $64,240,726, while that of Michigan, without a single slave, was $116,593,580. The whole accumulated valuation of all the Slave States, deducting the asserted property in human flesh, in 1850, was only $1,655,945,137; but the valuation of New York alone, in 1855, reached the nearly equal sum of $1,401,285,279. The valuation of Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Texas, all together, in 1850, deducting human flesh, was $573,332,860, or simply $1.81 per acre—being less than that of Massachusetts alone, which was $573,342,286, or $114.85 per acre.

The Slave States boast of *agriculture*; but here again, notwithstanding their superior natural advantages, they must yield to the Free States at every point, in the number of farms and plantations, in the number of acres of improved lands, in the cash value of farms, in the average value per acre, and in the value of farming implements and machinery. Here is a short table:

Free States.—Number of farms, 877,736; acres of improved land, 57,688,040; cash value of farms, $2,143,344,437 average value per acre, $19.83; value of farming implements, $85,736,-658.

Slave States.—Number of farms, 564,203; acres of improved land, 54,970,427; cash value of farms, $1,117,649,649; average value per acre, $6.18; value of farming implements, $65,345,-625.

Such is the mighty contrast. But it does not stop here. Careful tables place the agricultural products of the Free States, for the year ending June, 1850 at $858,634,334, while those of the Slave States were $631,277,417; the product per acre in the Free States at $7.94, and the product per acre in the Slave States at $3.49; and the average product of each agriculturist in the Free States at $342, and in the Slave States at $171.

Thus the Free States, with a smaller population engaged in agriculture than the Slave States, with smaller territory, show an annual sum total of agricultural products surpassing those of the Slave States by two hundred and twenty-seven millions of dollars, while twice as much is produced on an acre, and more than twice as much is produced by each agriculturist. The monopoly of cotton, rice, and cane sugar, with a climate granting two and sometimes three crops in a year, are thus impotent in the competition with Freedom.

In *manufactures*, the failure of the Slave States is greater still. It appears at all points, in the capital employed, in the value of the raw material, in the annual wages, and in the annual product. A short table will show the contrast:

Free States.—Capital, $430,240,051; value of raw material, $465,844,092; annual wages, $195,976,453; annual product, $842,586,058.

Slave States.—Capital, $95,029,879; value of raw material, $86,190,629; annual wages, $33,257,360; annual product, $165,413,027.

This might be illustrated by details with regard to different manufactures—whether of shoes, cotton, woolen, pig iron, wrought iron, and iron castings—all showing the contrast. It might also be illustrated by a comparison between different States; showing, for instance, that the manufactures of Massachusetts during the last year, exceeded those of all the Slave States combined.

In *commerce*, the failure of the Slave States is on yet a larger scale. Under this head, the census does not supply proper statistics, and we are left, therefore, to approximations from other quarters; but these are enough for our purpose. It appears that, of the products which enter into commerce, the Free States had an amount valued at $1,377,199,968; the Slave States an amount valued only at $410,754,992; that of the persons engaged in trade, the Free States had 136,856, and the Slave States 52,622; and that of the tonnage employed, the Free States had 2,790,195 tons, and the Slave States only 726,285. This was in 1850. But in 1855 the disproportion was still greater, the Free States having 4,252,615 tons, and the Slave States 855,517 tons, being a difference of five to one; and the tonnage of Massachusetts alone being 970,727 tons, an amount larger than that of all the Slave States. The tonnage built during this year, by the Free States was 528,844 tons; by the Slave States, 52,959 tons. Maine alone built 215,905 tons, or more than four times the whole built in the Slave States.

The foreign commerce, as indicated by the exports and imports in 1855, of the Free States, was $404,368,503; of the Slave States, $132,067,216. The exports of the Free States were $167,520,693; of the Slave States including the vaunted cotton crop, $132,007,216. The imports of the Free States were $236,947,810; of the Slave States, $24,586,528. The foreign commerce of New York alone was more than twice as large as that of all the Slave States; her imports were larger, and her exports were larger also. Add to this testimony of figures the testimony of a Virginian, Mr. Loudon, in a letter written just before the sitting of a Southern Commercial Convention. Thus he complains and testifies:

"There are not half a dozen vessels engaged in our own trade that are owned in Virginia; and I have been unable to find a vessel at Liverpool loading for Virginia within three years, during the height of our busy season."

Railroads and canals are the avenues of commerce; and here again the Free States excel. Of railroads in operation in 1854, there were 13,105 miles in the Free States, and 4,212 in the Slave States. Of canals there were 3,682 miles in the Free States, and 1,116 in the Slave States.

The *Post Office*, which is not only the agent of commerce, but of civilization, joins in the uniform testimony. According to the tables for 1859, the postage collected in the Free States was $5,532,999, and the expense of carrying the mails $6,748,189, leaving a deficit of $1,215,189. In the Slave States the amount collected was only $1,988,050, and the expense of carrying the mails $6,016,612, leaving the enormous deficit of $4,028,568; the difference between the two deficits being $2,813,372. The Slave States did not pay one-third of the expense of transporting their mails; and not a single Slave State paid for the transportation of its mails; not even the small State of Delaware. Massachusetts, besides paying for hers, had a surplus larger than the whole amount collected in South Carolina.

According to the census of 1850, the value of *churches* in the Free States was $67,773,477; in the Slave States, $21,674,581.

The *voluntary charity* contributed in 1855, for certain leading purposes of Christian benevolence, was, in the Free States, $953,813; for the same purposes, in the Slave States, $194,784. For the Bible cause, the Free States contributed $319,667; the Slave States, $68,125. For the missionary cause, the first contributed $319,667; and the second, $101,934. For the Tract Society, the first contributed $131,972; and the second, $24,725. The amount contributed in Massachusetts for the support of missions was greater than that contributed by all the Slave States, and more than eight times that contributed by South Carolina.

Nor have the Free States been backward in charity, when the Slave States have been smitten. The records of Massachusetts show that as long ago as 1781, at the beginning of the government, there was an extensive contribution throughout the Commonwealth, under the particular direction of that eminent patriot, Samuel Adams, for the relief of inhabitants of South Carolina and Georgia. In 1855 we were saddened by the prevalence of yellow fever in Portsmouth, Virginia; and now, from a report of the relief committee of that place, we learn that the amount of charity contributed by the Slave States, exclusive of Virginia, the afflicted State, was $12,182; and, including Virginia, it was $33,398; while $42,547 were contributed by the Free States.

In all this array we see the fatal influence of Slavery; but its Barbarism is yet more conspicuous when we consider its *Educational Establishments*, and the unhappy results, which naturally ensue from their imperfect character.

Of *colleges*, in 1856, the Free States had 61, and the Slave States 59; but the comparative efficacy of the institutions which assume this name may be measured by certain facts. The number of graduates in the Free States was 47,752, in the Slave States 19,648; the number of ministers educated in Slave colleges was 747, in the Free colleges 10,702; and the number of volumes in the libraries of Slave colleges 308,011; in the libraries of the Free colleges 667,227. If the materials were at hand for a comparison between these colleges, in buildings, cabinets, and scientific apparatus, or in the standard of scholarship, the difference would be still more apparent.

Of *professional schools*, teaching law, medicine, and theology, the Free States had 65, with 269 professors, 4,426 students, and 175,951 volumes in their libraries, while the Slave States had only 32 professional schools, with 122 professors, 1,807 students, and 30,796 volumes in their libraries. The whole number educated at these institutions in the Free States was 23,513, in the Slave States 3,812. Of these, the largest number in the Slave States study law, next medicine, and lastly theology. According to the

ceusus, there are only 808 in the Slave theological schools, and 747 studying for the ministry in the Slave colleges; and this is all the record we have of the education of the Slave clergy.

Of *academies and private schools*, in 1850, the Free States, notwithstanding their multitudinous public schools, had 3,197, with 7,175 teachers, 154,893 pupils, and an annual income of $2,457,372; the Slave States had 2,797 academies and private schools, with 4 913 teachers, 104.976 pupils, and an annual income of $2,079,724. In the absence of public schools, to a large extent, where slavery exists, the dependence must be chiefly upon private schools; and yet even in these the Slave States fall below the Free States, whether we consider the number of pupils, the number of teachers, or the amount paid for their support.

In *public schools*, open to all, alike the poor and the rich, the eminence of the Free States is complete. Here the figures show a difference as wide as that between Freedom and Slavery. Their number in the Free States is 62,433, with 72,621 teachers, and with 2,769,901 pupils, supported by an annual expense of $6 780,337. Their number in the Slave States is 18,507, with 19,307 teachers, and with 581,861 pupils, supported by an annual expense of $2,719,534. This difference may be illustrated by details. Virginia, an old State, and more than a third larger than Ohio, has 67,353 pupils in her public schools, while the latter State has 484,153. Arkansas, equal in age and size with Michigan, has only 8,493 pupils at her public schools, while the latter State has 110,455. South Carolina, three times as large as Massachusetts, has 17,838 pupils at public school, while the latter State has 176,475. South Carolina spends for this purpose, annually, $200,600; Massachusetts, $1,006,795. Baltimore, with a population of 169,012, on the northern verge of Slavery, has school buildings valued at $105,729; those of Boston are valued at $729,502. Boston, with a population smaller than that of Baltimore, has 203 public schools, with 353 teachers, and 21,678 pupils, supported at an annual expense of $237,000; Baltimore has only 36 public schools, with 139 teachers, and 8,011 pupils, supported at an annual expense of $32,423. But even these figures do not disclose the whole difference; for there exist in the Free States teachers' institutes, normal schools, lyceums, and public courses of lectures, which are unknown in the region of Slavery. These advantages are enjoyed also by the children of colored persons; and here is a comparison which shows the degradation of the Slave States. It is their habit particularly to deride free colored persons. See, now, with what cause. The number of colored persens in the Free States is 196,016, of whom 22,043, or more than one-ninth, attend school, which is a larger proportion than is supplied by the whites of the Slave States. In Massachusetts there are 9,064 colored persons, of whom 1,439, or nearly one-sixth, attend school, which is a much larger proportion than is supplied by the whites of South Carolina.

Among educational establishments are *public libraries;* and here, again, the Free States have their customary eminence, whether we consider libraries strictly called public, or libraries of the common school, of the Sunday school, of the college, and of the church. Here the disclosures are startling. The number of libraries in the Free States is 14,911, and the sum total of volumes is 3 888,234; the number of libraries in the Slave States is 695, and the sum total of volumes is 649,577; showing an excess for Freedom of more than fourteen thousand libraries, and more than three millions of volumes. In the Free States the common school libraries are 11,881, and contain 1,589,683 volumes; in the Slave States they are 186, and contain 57,721 volumes. In the Free States the Sunday school libraries are 1,713, and contain 478,858 volumes; in the Slave States they are 275, and contain 63,463 volumes. In the Free States the college libraries are 132, and contain 660,573 volumes; in the Slave States they are 79, and contain 249,248 volumes. In the Free States the church libraries are 109, and contain 52,723 volumes; in the Slave States they are 21, and contain 5,627 volumes. In the Free States the libraries strictly called public, and not included under the heads already enumerated, are 1,058, and contain 1,106,397 volumes; those of the Slave States are 152, and contain 273,518 volumes.

Turn these figures over, look at them in any light, and the conclusion will be irresistible for Freedom. The college libraries alone of the Free States are greater than all the libraries of Slavery. So, also, are the libraries of Massachusetts alone greater than all the libraries of Slavery; and the common school libraries alone of New York are more than twice as large as all the libraries of Slavery. Michigan has 107,943 volumes in her libraries; Arkansas has 420.

Among educational establishments. one of the most efficient is the *Press:* and here, again, all things testify for Freedom. The Free States excel in the number of newspapers and periodicals published, whether daily, semi-weekly, weekly, semi-monthly, monthly, or quarterly; and whatever their character, whether literary, neutral, political, religious, or scientific. The whole aggregate circulation in the Free States is 334,146,281; in the Slave States, 81,038,693. In Free Michigan, 3,247,736; in Slave Arkansas, 377,000. In Free Ohio 30,473,407; in Slave Kentucky, 6,582,838. In Slave South Carolina, 7,145,930; in Free Massachusetts, 64,820,564—a larger number than in the ten Slave States, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana and Texas, combined. This enormous disproportion in the aggregate is also preserved in the details. In the Slave States, political newspapers find more favor than any others; but even of these they publish only 47,243,209 copies, while the Free States publish 163,583,668. Of neutral newspapers, the Slave States publish 8,812,620; the Free States, 79,156,738. Of religious newspapers, the Slave States publish 4,364,832; the Free States, 29,280,652. Of literary journals, the Slave States publish 20,245,360; the Free States, 57,478,768. And of scientific journals, the Slave States publish 372,672; the Free States, 4,521,260. Of these latter, the number of copies published in Massachusetts alone is 2,033,260—more than five times the number in the whole land of Slavery. Thus, in contributions to science, literature, religion, and even politics, as attested by the activity of the periodical press, do the Slave States miserably fail, while darkness

gathers over them. And this seems to be increasing with time. According to the census of 1810, the disproportion in this respect between the two regions was only as two to one. It is now more than five to one, and is still going on.

The same disproportion appears with regard to persons connected with the Press. In the Free States, the number of *printers* was 11,822, of whom 1,229 were in Massachusetts; in the Slave States there were 2,895, of whom South Carolina had only 141. In the Free States, the number of *publishers* was 331; in the Slave States, 24. Of these, Massachusetts had 59, or more than twice as many as all the Slave States; while South Carolina had none. In the Free States, the *authors* were 73; in the Slave States, 9—of whom Massachusetts had 17, and South Carolina 6. These suggestive illustrations are all derived from the last official census. But if we go to other sources, the contrast is still the same. Of the authors mentioned in Duyckink's Cyclopedia of American Literature, 403 are of the Free States, and only 87 of the Slave States. Of the poets mentioned in Griswold's Poets and Poetry of America, 123 are of the Free States, and only 17 of the Slave States. Of the poets, whose place of birth appears in Reed's Female Poets of America, 73 are of the Free States, and only 11 of the Slave States. And if we try authors by weight or quality, it is the same as when we try them by numbers. Out of the Free States have come all whose works have taken a place in the permanent literature of the country—Irving, Prescott, Sparks, Bancroft, Emerson, Motley, Hildreth, and Hawthorne; also, Bryant, Longfellow, Dana, Halleck, Whittier, and Lowell—and I might add indefinitely to the list. But what name from the Slave States could find a place there?

A similar disproportion appears in the number of *Patents*, attesting the inventive industry of the contrasted regions, issued during the last three years, 1857, 1858 and 1859. In the Free States there were 9,560; in the Slave States, 1,449—making a difference of 8,111 in favor of Freedom. The number in Free Massachusetts was 972; in Slave South Carolina, 39. The number in Free Connecticut, small in territory and population, was 628; in Slave Virginia, large in territory and population, 184.

From all these things we might infer the *ignorance* prevalent in the Slave States; but this shows itself in specific results of a deplorable character, authenticated by the official census. It appears that in the Slave States there were 493,026 native white persons over twenty years of age who cannot read and write, while in the Free States, with double the white population, there were but 248,725 native whites over twenty years of age in this unhappy predicament. In the Slave States the proportion was 1 to 12; in the Free States it was 1 to 53. The number in Free Massachusetts, with a population of nearly a million, was 1,005, or 1 in 517; the number in Slave South Carolina, with a population under three hundred thousand, was 15,580, or 1 in 7. The number in Free Connecticut was 1 in 277; in Slave Virginia, 1 in 5; in Free New Hampshire 1 in 201; and in Slave North Carolina, 1 in 3.

Before closing this picture of Slavery, where the dismal colors all come from official figures, there are two other aspects in which for a moment it may be regarded:

1. The first is the influence which it has on *emigration*. It is stated in the official compendium of the census, (page 115,) that those persons living in Slave States who are natives of Free States are more numerous than those living in Free States who are natives of Slave States. This is an egregious error. Just the contrary is true. The census of 1850 found 609,371 in the Free States who were born in the Slave States, while only 206,638 born in the Free States were in the Slave States. And since the white population of the Free States is double that of the Slave States, it appears that the proportion of whites moving from Slavery is six times greater than that of the whites moving into slavery. In this simple fact is disclosed something of the aversion to Slavery which is aroused even in the Slave States.

2. The second aspect is furnished by the character of the region on the border line between Freedom and Slavery. In general, the value of lands in Slave States adjoining Freedom is advanced, while the value of corresponding lands in Free States is diminished. The effects of Freedom and Slavery are reciprocal. Slavery is a bad neighbor. Freedom is a good neighbor. In Virginia, lands naturally poor are, by their nearness to Freedom, worth $12.98 an acre, while richer lands in other parts of the State are worth only $8.42. In Illinois, lands bordering upon Slavery are worth only $4.54 an acre, while other lands in Illinois are worth $8.05. As in the value of lands so in all other influences is Slavery felt for evil, and Freedom felt for good; and thus is it clearly shown to be for the interest of the Slave States to be surrounded by a circle of Free States.

Thus, at every point is the character of Slavery more and more manifest, rising and dilating into an overshadowing Barbarism, darkening the whole land. Through its influence, population, values of all kinds, manufactures, commerce, railroads, canals, charities, the post office, colleges, professional schools, academies, public schools, newspapers, periodicals, books, authorship, inventions, are all stunted, and, under a Government which professes to be founded on the intelligence of the people, one in twelve of the white adults in the region of Slavery is officially reported as unable to read and write. Never was the saying of Montesquieu more triumphantly verified, that countries are not cultivated by reason of their fertility, but by reason of their liberty. To this truth the Slave States constantly testify by every possible voice. Liberty is the powerful agent which drives the plow, the spindle, and the keel; which opens avenues of all kinds; which inspires charity; which awakens a love of knowledge, and supplies the means of gratifying it. Liberty is the first of schoolmasters.

Unerring and passionless figures thus far have been our witnesses. But their testimony will be enhanced by a final glance at the *geographical character* of the Slave States; and here there is a singular and instructive parallel.

Jefferson described Virginia as fast sinking to be "the Barbary of the Union"—meaning, of course, the Barbary of his day, which had not yet turned against Slavery. In this allusion he was wiser than he knew. Though on

different sides of the Atlantic and on different continents, our Slave States and the original Barbary States occupy nearly the same parallels of latitude; occupy nearly the same extent of longitude; embrace nearly the same number of square miles; enjoy kindred advantages of climate, being equally removed from the cold of the North and the burning heat of the tropics; and also enjoy kindred boundaries of land and water, with kindred advantages of ocean and sea, with this difference, that the boundaries of the two regions are precisely reversed, so that where is land in one case is water in the other, while in both cases there is the same extent of ocean and the same extent of sea. Nor is this all. Algiers, for a long time the most obnoxious place in the Barbary States of Africa, once branded by an indignant chronicler as "the wall of the barbarian world," is situated near the parallel of 36° 30' north latitude, being the line of the Missouri compromise, which once marked the "wall" of Slavery in our country west of the Mississippi, while Morocco, the chief present seat of Slavery in the African Barbary, is on the parallel of Charleston. There are no two spaces on the surface of the globe, equal in extent, (and an examination of the map will verify what I am about to state,) which present so many distinctive features of resemblance; whether we consider the common parallels of latitude on which they lie, the common nature of their boundaries, their common productions, their common climate, or the common Barbarism which sought shelter in both. I do not stop to inquire why Slavery—banished at last from Europe, banished also from that part of this hemisphere which corresponds in latitude to Europe—should have entrenched itself in both hemispheres between the same parallels of latitude, so that Virginia, Corolina, Mississippi, and Missouri, should be the American complement to Morocco, Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis. But there is one important point in the parallel which remains to be fulfilled. The barbarous Emperor of Morocco, in the words of a Treaty, has expressed his desire that Slavery might pass from the memory of men, while Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis, after cherishing Slavery with a tenacity equalled only by the tenacity of South Carolina, have successively renounced it and delivered it over to the indignation of mankind. In following this example the parallel will be complete, and our Barbary will become the complement in Freedom to the African Barbary, as it has already been its complement in Slavery, and is unquestionably its complement in geographical character.

II. From the consideration of Slavery in its practical results, illustrated by the contrast between the Free States and Slave States, I pass now to another stage of the argument, and proceed to exhibit Slavery in its influence on the Character of Slave-masters. Nothing could I undertake more painful, and yet there is nothing which is more essential to the discussion, especially in response to the pretensions of Senators on this floor, nor is there any point on which the evidence is more complete.

It is in the Character of Slavery itself that we are to find the Character of Slave-masters; but I need not go back to the golden lips of Chrysostom to learn that "Slavery is the fruit of covetousness, of extravagance, of insatiable greediness:" for we have already seen that this five-fold enormity is inspired by the single idea of *compelling men to work without wages.* This spirit must naturally appear in the Slave-master. But the eloquent Christian Saint did not disclose the whole truth. Slavery is founded on violence, as we have already too clearly seen; of course it can be sustained only by kindred violence, sometimes against the defenceless slave, sometimes against the freeman whose indignation is aroused at the outrage. It is founded on brutal and vulgar pretensions, as we have already too clearly seen; of course it can be sustained only by kinded brutality and vulgarity. The denial of all rights in the slave can be sustained only by a disregard of other rights, common to the whole community, whether of the person, of the press, or of speech. Where this exists there can be but one supreme law, to which all other laws, legislative or social, are subordinate, and this is the pretended law of Slavery. All these things must be manifest in Slave-masters, and yet, unconscious of their true condition, they make boasts which reveal still further the unhappy influence. Barbarous standards of conduct are unblushingly avowed. The swagger of a bully is called chivalry; a swiftness to quarrel is called courage; the bludgeon is adopted as the substitute for argument; and assassination is lifted to be one of the Fine Arts. Long ago it was fixed certain that the day which made man a slave "took half his worth away"—words from the ancient harp of Homer, resounding through long generations. Nothing here is said of the human being at the other end of the chain. To aver that on this same day all his worth is taken away might seem inconsistent with exceptions which we gladly recognise; but alas! it is too clear, both from reason and from evidence, that, bad as Slavery is for the Slave, it is worse for the Master.

In making this exposure I am fortified, at the outset, by two classes of authorities, whose testimony it will be difficult to question; the first is American and founded on personal experience; the second is philosophical, and founded on everlasting truth.

First, *American Authority;* and here I adduce words often quoted, which dropped from the lips of Slave-masters in those bitter days when, seeing the wrong of Slavery, they escaped from its injurious influence. Of these none expressed themselves with more vigor than Colonel Mason, a Slave-master from Virginia, in debate on the adoption of the National Constitution. These are his words:

"Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor when performed by slaves. They prevent the emigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country. *They produce the most pernicious effect on manners.* Every Master of Slaves is born a petty tyrant. They bring the judgment of Heaven on a country."

Thus, with a few touches, does this Slave-master portray his class, putting them in that hateful list, which, according to every principle of liberty, must be resisted so long as we obey God. And this same testimony also found expression from the fiery soul of Jefferson. Here are some of his words:

"There must be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people, produced by the existence of Slavery among us The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other; our children see this,

and learn to imitate it * * * *The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances.* And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who permitting one-half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, *transforms those into despots*, and these into enemies; destroys the morals of the one part, and the *amor patriæ* of the other! * * * With the morals of the people, their industry also is destroyed."

Next comes the *Philosophic Authority;* and here the language which I quote may be less familiar, but it is hardly less commanding. Among names of such weight, I shall not discriminate, but shall simply follow the order of time in which they appeared. First is John Locke, the great author of the English System of Intellectual Philosophy, who though once unhappily conceding indulgence to American Slavery, in another place describes it, in words which every Slave-master should know, as—

"The state of war continued between a lawful conqueror and his captive. * * * So opposite to the generous temper and courage of our nation, that *'tis hardly to be conceived that an Englishman*, MUCH LESS A GENTLEMAN, *should plead for it.*"

Then comes Adam Smith, the founder of the science of Political Economy, who, in his work on Morals, thus utters himself:

"There is not a negro from the coast of Africa who does not possess a degree of magnanimity which the soul of his sordid master is too often scarce capable of conceiving. Fortune never exerted more cruelly her empire over mankind, than when she subjected these nations of heroes to the refuse of gaols of Europe, to wretches who possess the virtues neither of the countries which they come from, nor of those which they go to. *and whose levity, brutality and baseness, so justly expose them to the contempt of the vanquished.*"—*Theory of Moral Sentiments, Part V, chapter* 2.

This judgment pronounced just a century ago, was repelled by the Slave-masters of Virginia, in a feeble publication which attests at least their own consciousness that they were the criminals arraigned by the distinguished philosopher. This was soon followed by the testimony of the great English moralist, Dr. Johnson, who, in a letter to a friend, thus shows his opinion of Slave-masters:

"To omit for a year, or for a day, the most efficacious method of advancing Christianity, in compliance with any purposes, that terminate on this side of the grave, is a crime of which I know not that the world has had an example, except in the practice of *the planters of America, a race of mortals whom, I suppose, no other man wishes to resemble.*"—*Letter to William Drummond, 18th August*, 1766. (*Boswell's Life of Johnson, by Croker.*)

With such authorities, American and Philosophic, I need not hesitate in this ungracious task; but Truth, which is mightier than Mason and Jefferson, than John Locke, Adam Smith, and Samuel Johnson, marshals the evidence in unbroken succession.

Proceeding with this argument, which broadens as we advance, we shall see Slave-masters (1) in the Law of Slavery, (2) in their relations with Slaves, (3) in their relations with each other and with Society, and (4) in that unconsciousness which renders them insensible to their true character.

(1.) As in considering the Character of Slavery, so in considering the Character of Slave-masters, we must begin with the *Law of Slavery* which, as their work, testifies against them. In the face of such an unutterable abomination, where impiety, cruelty, brutality, and robbery, all strive for mastery, it is in vain to assert the humanity or refinement of its authors. Full well I know that the conscience which speaks so powerfully to the solitary soul, is often silent in the corporate body, and that, in all ages and countries, numbers, when gathered in communities and States, have sanctioned acts from which the individual revolts. And yet I know no surer way of judging a people than by its laws, especially where those laws have been long continued and openly maintained.

Whatever may be the eminence of individual virtue—and I would not so far disparage humanity as to suppose that the offences which may be general where Slavery exists are universal—it is not reasonable or logical to infer that the masses of Slave-masters are better than the Law of Slavery. And since the Law itself degrades the slave to be a chattel, and submits him to their irresponsible control, with power to bind and to scourge; to usurp the fruits of another's labor; to pollute the body; and to outrage all ties of family, making marriage impossible—we must conclude that such enormities are sanctioned by Slave-masters, while the exclusion of testimony, and prohibition of instruction—by supplementary law—complete the evidence of their complicity. And this conclusion must stand unquestioned just so long as the Law of Slavery exists unrepealed. Cease, then, to blazon the humanity of Slave-masters. Tell me not of the lenity with which this cruel Code is tempered to its unhappy subjects. Tell me not of the sympathy which overflows from the mansion of the master to the cabin of the slave. In vain you assert such "happy accidents." In vain you show that there are individuals who do not exert the wickedness of the law. The Barbarism still endures, solemnly, legislatively, judicially attested in the very SLAVE CODE, and proclaims constantly the character of its authors. And this is the first article in the evidence against Slave-masters.

(2.) I am next brought to *Slave-masters in their relations with Slaves;* and here the argument is founded upon facts, and upon presumptions irresistible as facts. Only lately has inquiry burst into that gloomy world of bondage, and disclosed its secrets. But enough is already known to arouse the indignant condemnation of mankind. For instance, here is a simple advertisement—one of thousands—from the *Georgia Messenger:*

"RUN AWAY—My man Fountain: has holes in his ears, a scar on the right side of his forehead; has been shot in the hind parts of his legs; is marked on his back with the whip. Apply to Robert Beasley, Macon, Ga."

Holes in the ears; scar on the forehead; shot in the legs, and marks of the lash on the back! Such are the tokens by which a Slave-master proposes to identify his slave.

And here is another advertisement, revealing Slave-masters in a different light. It is from the *National Intelligencer*, published at the Capital; and I confess the pain with which I cite such an indecency in a journal of such respectability.—Of course, it appeared without the knowledge of the editors; but it is none the less an illustrative example:

"FOR SALE.—An accomplished and handsome lady's maid. She is just sixteen years of age; was raised in a genteel family in Maryland; and is now proposed to be sold, not for any fault, but simply because the owner has no further use for her. A note directed to C. D., Gadsby's Hotel, will receive prompt attention."

A sated libertine, in a land where vice is legalized, could not expose his victim with apter words.

These two instances will illustrate a class.

In the recent work of Mr. Olmstead, a close observer and traveler in the Slave States which abounds in pictures of Slavery, expressed with caution, and evident regard to truth, will be found still another, where a Slave-master thus frankly confesses his experience:

"I can tell you how you can break a nigger of running away, certain," said the Slave-master. "There was an old fellow I used to know in Georgia, that always cured his so. If a nigger ran away, when he caught him, he would bind his knee over a log, and fasten him so he couldn't stir; then he'd take a pair of pincers, and pull one of his toe-nails out by the roots; and tell him that if he ever run away again, he would pull out two of them; and if he run away again after that, he told him he'd pull out four of them, and so on doubling each time. He never had to do it more than twice; it always cured them."—*Olmstead's Texas Journey*, 105.

Like this story, which is from the lips of a Slave-master, is another, where the master, angry because his slave had sought to regain his God-given liberty, deliberately cut the tendons of his heel, thus horribly maiming him for life!

It is in vain that these instances are denied. Their accumulating number, authenticated in every possible manner, by the press, by a cloud of witnesses, and by the confession of Slave-masters, stares us constantly in the face.

And here we are brought again to the slave code, under the shelter of which these and worse things may be done, with complete impunity. Listen to the remarkable words of Chief Justice Ruffin, of North Carolina, who, in a solemn decision, thus portrays, affirms, and deplores, this terrible latitude:

"The obedience of the slave," he says, "is the consequence only of *uncontrolled authority over the body.* * * * *The power of the master must be absolute to render the submission of the slave perfect.* I must freely confess my sense of the harshness of this proposition. I feel it as deeply as any man can. And, as a principle of moral right, every person in his retirement must repudiate it. But, in the actual condition of things, it must be so. There is no remedy. *This disciplin belongs to the state of Slavery.* It is inherent in the relation of master and slave."—*The State* v. *Mann*, 2 *Devereaux R.*, 292.

And this same terrible latitude has been thus expounded in a recent judicial decision of Virginia:

"It is the policy of the law, in respect to the relation of master and slave, and for the sake of securing proper subordination and obedience on the part of the slave, *to protect the master from prosecution, even if the whipping and punishment be malicious, cruel, and excessive.*"—*Santher* v. *Cwelt*, 7 *Grattan*, 673.

Can Barbarism further go? Here is an irresponsible power, rendered more irresponsible still by the seclusion of the plantation, and absolutely fortified by the supplementary law excluding the testimony of slaves. That under its shelter enormities should occur, stranger than fiction, too terrible for imagination, and surpassing any individual experience, is simply according to the course of nature and the course of history. The visitation of the abbeys in England disclosed vice and disorder in startling forms, cloaked by the irresponsible privacy of monastic life. A similar visitation of plantations would disclose more fearful results, cloaked by the irresponsible privacy of Slavery. Every Slave-master on his plantation is a Bashaw, with all the prerogatives of a Turk. According to Hobbes, he is "a petty king." This is true; and every plantation is of itself a petty kingdom, with more than the immunities of an abbey. Six thousand skulls of infants are said to have been taken from a single fish-pond near a nunnery, to the dismay of Pope Gregory. Under the law of Slavery, infants, the offspring of masters "who dream of Freedom in a slave's embrace," are not thrown into a fish-pond, but something worse is done. They are sold. But this is only a single glimpse. Slavery, in its recesses, is another Bastile, whose horrors will never be known until it all is razed to the ground; it is the Dismal Castle of Giant Despair, which, when captured by the pilgrims, excited their wonder, as they saw "the dead bodies that lay here and there in the castle-yard, and how full of dead men's bones the dungeon was." The recorded horrors of Slavery seem to be infinite, and each day, by the escape of its victims, they are still further attested, while the door of the vast prison-house is left ajar. But, alas! unless the examples of history and the lessons of political wisdom are alike delusive, its unrecorded horrors must assume a form of yet more fearful dimensions, as we try to contemplate them. Baffling all attempts at description, they sink into that chapter of Sir Thomas Browne, entitled, *Of some Relations whose Truth we fear;* and among kindred things whereof, according to this eloquent philosopher, there remains no register but that of hell.

If this picture of the relations of Slave-masters with their slaves could receive any further darkness, it would be by introducing the figures of the congenial agents through which the Barbarism is maintained; *the Slave-overseer*, *the Slave-breeder*, and *the Slave-hunter*, each without a peer except in his brother, and the whole constituting the triumvirate of Slavery, in whom its essential brutality, vulgarity, and grossness, are all embodied. There is the Slave-overseer, with his bloody lash, fitly described in his Life of Patrick Henry by Mr. Wirt, who, born in Virginia, knew the class, as "last and lowest, most abject, degraded, unprincipled," and his hands wield at will the irresponsible power. There is the Slave-breeder, who assumes a higher character, and even enters legislative halls, where, in unconscious insensibility, he shocks civilization by denying, like Mr. Gholson, of Virginia, any alleged distinction between the "female slave" and "the brood mare," by openly asserting the necessary respite from work during the gestation of the female slave as the ground of property in her offspring, and by proclaiming that in this "vigintial" crop of human flesh consists much of the wealth of his State; while another Virginian, not yet hardened to this debasing trade, whose annual sacrifice reaches 25,000 human souls, confesses the indignation and shame with which he beholds his State "converted into *one grand menagerie*, where men are reared for the market, like oxen for the shambles." And lastly there is the Slave-hunter, with the blood-hound as his brutal symbol, who pursues slaves, as the hunter pursues game, and does not hesitate in the public prints to advertise his Barbarism thus:

"BLOOD-HOUNDS.—I have TWO of the FINEST DOGS for CATCHING NEGROES in the Southwest. They can take the trail TWELVE HOURS after the NEGRO HAS PASSED, and catch him with ease. I live four miles southwest of Bolivar, on the road leading from Bolivar to Whitesville. I am ready at all times to catch runaway negroes. DAVID TURNER.

"March 2, 1853."—*West Tennessee Democrat.*

The blood-hound was known in early Scottish

history; it was once vindictively put upon the trail of Robert Bruce, and in barbarous days, by a cruel license of war, it was directed against the marauders of the Scottish border; but more than a century has passed since the last survivor of the race, kept as a curiosity, was fed on meal in Ettrick Forest.* The blood-hound was employed by Spain, against the natives of this continent, and the eloquence of Chatham never touched a truer chord than when, gathering force from the condemnation of this brutality, he poured his thunder upon the kindred brutality of the scalping-knife, adopted as an instrument of war by a nation professing civilization. Tardily introduced into our Republic, some time after the Missouri Compromise, when Slavery became a political passion and Slave-masters began to throw aside all disguise, the blood-hound has become the representative of our Barbarism in one of its worst forms, when engaged in the pursuit of a fellow-man who is asserting his inborn title to himself; and this brute is, indeed, typical of the whole brutal leash of Slave-hunters, who, whether at home on Slave-soil, under the name of Slave-catchers, and kidnappers, or at a distance, under politer names, insult Human Nature by the enforcement of this Barbarism.

(3.) From this dreary picture of Slave-masters with their slaves and their triumvirate of vulgar instruments, I pass to another more dreary still, and more completely exposing the influence of Slavery; I mean the *relations of Slave-masters with each other*, also *with Society* and *Government*, or, in other words, the Character of Slave-masters, as displayed in the general relations of life. And here I need your indulgence. Not in triumph or in taunt do I approach this branch of the subject. Yielding only to the irresistible exigency of the discussion and in direct response to the assumptions on this floor, especially by the Senator from Virginia, [Mr. MASON,] I shall proceed. If I touch Slavery to the quick, and enable Slave-masters to see themselves as others see them, I shall do nothing beyond the strictest line of duty in this debate.

One of the choicest passages of the master Italian poet, Dante, is where a scene of transcendent virtue is described as sculptured in "visible speech" on the long gallery which led to the Heavenly Gate. The poet felt the inspiration of the scene, and placed it on the wayside, where it could charm and encourage. This was natural. Nobody can look upon virtue and justice, if it be only in images and pictures, without feeling a kindred sentiment. Nobody can be surrounded by vice and wrong, by violence and brutality, if it be only in images and pictures, without coming under their degrading influence. Nobody can live with the one without advantage; nobody can live with the other without loss. Who could pass his life in the secret chamber where are gathered the impure relics of Pompeii, without becoming indifferent to loathsome things? But if these loathsome things are not merely sculptured and painted—if they exist in living reality—if they enact their hideous capers in life, as in the criminal pretensions of Slavery—while the lash plays and the blood spirts—while women are whipped and children are sold—while marriage is polluted and annulled—while the parental tie is rudely torn—while honest gains are filched or robbed—while the soul itself is shut down in all the darkness of ignorance, and while God himself is defied in the pretension that man can have property in his fellow-man; if all these things are present, not merely in images and pictures, but in reality, their influence on character must be incalculable.

It is according to irresistible law that men are fashioned by what is about them, whether climate, scenery, life, or institutions. Like produces like, and this ancient proverb is verified always. Look at the miner, delving low down in darkness, and the mountaineer, ranging on airy heights, and you will see a contrast in character, and even in personal form. The difference between a coward and a hero may be traced in the atmosphere which each has breathed; and how much more in the institutions under which each has been reared. If institutions generous and just ripen souls also generous and just, then other institutions must exhibit their influence also. Violence, brutality, injustice, barbarism, must be reproduced in the lives of all who live within their fatal sphere. The meat that is eaten by man enters into and becomes a part of his body; the madder which is eaten by a dog changes his bones to red; and the Slavery on which men live, in all its fivefold foulness, must become a part of themselves, discoloring their very souls, blotting their characters, and breaking forth in moral leprosy. This language is strong; but the evidence is even stronger. Some there may be of happy natures—like honorable Senators—who can thus feed and not be harmed. Mithridates fed on poison, and lived; and it may be that there is a moral Mithridates, who can swallow without bane the poison of Slavery.

Instead of "ennobling" the master, nothing can be clearer than that the slave drags his master down, and this process begins in childhood, and is continued through life. Living much in association with his slave, the master finds nothing to remind him of his own deficiencies, to prompt his ambition or excite his shame. Without these provocations to virtue, and without an elevating example, he naturally shares the Barbarism of the society which he keeps. Thus the very inferiority which the Slave-master attributes to the African race explains the melancholy condition of the communities in which his degradation is declared by law.

A single false principle or vicious thought may degrade a character otherwise blameless; and this is practically true of the Slave-master. Accustomed to regard men as property, his sensibilities are blunted and his moral sense is obscured. He consents to acts from which Civilization recoils. The early Church sold its property, and even its sacred vessels, for the redemption of captives. This was done on a remarkable occasion by St. Ambrose, and successive canons confirmed the example. But in the Slave States this is all reversed. Slaves there are often sold as the property of the Church, and an instance is related of a slave sold in South Carolina in order to buy plate for the communion table. Who can calculate the effect of such an example?

Surrounded by pernicious influences of all kinds, both positive and negative, the first making him do that which he ought not to do, and

* Scott's Lay of the Last Minstrel.—*Notes, Canto V.*

the second making him leave undone that which he ought to have done—through childhood, youth, and manhood, even unto age—unable while at home to escape these influences, overshadowed constantly by the portentous Barbarism about him, the Slave-master naturally adopts the bludgeon, the revolver, and the bowie-knife. Through these he governs his plantation, and secretly armed with these he enters the world. These are his congenial companions. To wear these is his pride; to use them becomes a passion, almost a necessity. Nothing contributes to violence so much as the wearing of the instruments of violence, thus having them always at hand to obey the lawless instincts of the individual. A barbarous standard is established; a duel is not dishonorable; a contest peculiar to our Slave-masters, known as a "street-fight," is not shameful; and modern imitators of Cain have a mark set upon them, not for reproach and condemnation, but for compliment and approval. I wish to keep within bounds; but unanswerable facts, accumulating in fearful quantities, attest that the social system, so much vaunted by honorable Senators, and which we are now asked to sanction and to extend, takes its character from this spirit, and with professions of Christianity on the lips, becomes Cain-like. And this is aggravated by the prevailing ignorance in the Slave States, where one in twelve of the adult white population is unable to read and write.

> "The boldest they who least partake the light,
> As game-cocks in the dark are trained to fight."

Of course there are exceptions, which we all gladly recognize, but it is this spirit which predominates and gives the social law. And here mark an important difference. Elsewhere violence shows itself in *spite* of law, whether social or statute; in the Slave States it is *because* of law both social and statute. Elsewhere it is pursued and condemned; in the Slave States it is adopted and honored. Elsewhere it is hunted as a crime; in the Slave States it takes its place among the honorable graces of society.

Let not these harsh statements stand on my authority. Listen to the testimony of two Governors of Slave States in their messages to the Legislatures:

"We long to see the day," said the Governor of Kentucky in 1837, "when the law will assert its majesty, and stop the wanton destruction of life which almost *daily* occurs within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth. *Men slaughter each other with almost perfect impunity.* A species of common law has grown up in Kentucky, which, were it written down, would, in all civilized countries, cause it to be rechristened, in derision, *the land of blood.*"

Such was the official confession of a Slave-master Governor of Kentucky. And here is the official confession made the same year by the Slave-master Governor of Alabama:

"We hear of homicides in different parts of the State continually, and yet have few convictions, and still fewer executions! Why do we hear of *stabbings and shootings* almost *daily* in some part or other of our State?"

A land of blood! Stabbings and shootings almost daily! Such is the official language. It was natural that contemporary newspapers should repeat what thus found utterance in high places. Here is a confession by a newspaper in Mississippi:

"The moral atmosphere in our State appears to be in a *deleterious and sanguinary condition.* Almost every exchange paper which reaches us contains *some inhuman and revolting case of murder or death by violence.*"—*Grand Gulf Advertiser, 27th June,* 1837.

Here is another confession by a newspaper in New Orleans:

"In view of the crimes which are daily committed, we are led to inquire whether it is owing to the inefficiency of our laws, or to the manner in which these laws are administered, *that this frightful deluge of human blood flows through our streets and our places of public resort.*"—*New Orleans Bee, 23d May,* 1838.

And here is testimony of a different character:

"No one who has not been *an integral part of a slave-holding community* can have any idea of its abominations. It is a whited sepulchre, full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness."

These are the words of a Southern lady, the daughter of the accomplished Judge Grimké of South Carolina.

A catalogue of affrays between politicians, commonly known as "street fights"—I use the phrase which comes from the land of Slavery—would show that these authorities were not mistaken. That famous Dutch picture, admired particularly by a successful engraving, and called the *Knife-fight,* presents a scene less revolting than one of these. Two or more men, armed to the teeth, meet in the streets, at a court-house or a tavern, shoot at each other with revolvers, then gash each other with knives, close, and roll upon the ground, covered with dirt and blood, struggling and stabbing till death, prostration, or surrender, puts an end to the conflict. Each instance tells a shameful story, and cries out against the social system which can tolerate such Barbarism. A catalogue of duels in our country would testify again to the reckless disregard of life where Slavery exists, and would exhibit Violence flaunting in the garb of Honor, and prating of a barbarous code disowned equally by reason and religion. But you have already supped too full of horrors, and I hasten on.

Pardon me if I stop for one moment to exhibit and denounce the Duel. I do it only because it belongs to the brood of Slavery. An enlightened Civilization has long ago rejected this relic of Barbarism, and never has one part of the argument against it been put more sententiously than by Franklin: "A duel decides nothing," said this patriot philosopher, "and the person appealing to it makes himself judge in his own cause, condemns the offender without a jury and undertakes himself to be the executioner." To these emphatic words I would add two brief propositions, which, if practically adopted, make the Duel impossible—first, that the acknowledgment of wrong with apology or explanation can never be otherwise than honorable; and secondly, that, in the absence of all such acknowledgment, no wrong can ever be repaired by a gladiatorial contest, where brute force, or skill, or chance, must decide the day. Iron and adamant are not stronger than these arguments; nor can any one attempt an answer without exposing his feebleness. And yet Slave-masters, disregarding its irrational character—insensible to its folly—heedless of its impiety—and unconscious of its Barbarism, openly adopt the Duel as a regulator of manners and conduct. Two voices from South Carolina have been raised against it, and I mention them with gladness as testimony even in that land of Slavery. The first was Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, who in the early days of the Republic openly declared his "abhorrence of the practice," and invoked the clergy of his State "as a particular favor at some convenient early day to preach a sermon on the sin and folly

of duelling." The other was Mr. Rhett, who on this floor openly declared as his reasons for declining the Duel, "that he feared God more than man." Generous words, for which many errors can be pardoned. But these voices condemn the social system of which the Duel is a natural product.

Looking now at the broad surface of society where Slavery exists, we shall find its spirit actively manifest in the suppression of all freedom of speech or of the press, especially with regard to this wrong. Nobody in the Slave States can speak or print against Slavery, except at the peril of life or liberty. St. Paul could call upon the people of Athens to give up the worship of unknown gods; he could live in his own hired house at Rome, and preach Christianity in this Heathen metropolis; but no man can be heard against Slavery in Charleston or Mobile. We condemn the Inquisition, which subjects all within its influence to censorship and secret judgment; but this tyranny is repeated in American Slave-masters. Truths as simple as the great discovery of Galileo are openly denied, and all who declare them are driven to recant. We condemn the Index Expurgatorius of the Roman Church; but American Slave-masters have an Index on which are inscribed all the generous books of the age. There is one book, the Marvel of recent literature, Uncle Tom's Cabin, which has been thus treated both by the Church and by the Slave-masters, so that it is honored by the same suppresion at the Vatican and at Charleston.

Not to dwell on these instances, there is one which has a most instructive ridiculousness. A religious discourse of the late Dr. Channing on West India Emancipation—the last effort of his beautiful career—was offered for sale by a book agent at Charleston. A prosecution by the South Carolina Association ensued, and the agent was held to bail in the sum of one thousand dollars. Shortly afterwards, the same agent received for sale a work by Dickens, freshly published, "American Notes;" but, determined not to expose himself again to the tyrannical Inquisition, he gave notice through the newspapers that the book "would be submitted to highly intelligent members of the South Carolina Association for *inspection*, and *if* the sale is approved by them, it will be for sale—if not, not."

Listen also to another recent instance, as recounted in the *Montgomery Mail*, a newspaper of Alabama:

"Last Saturday we devoted to the flames a large number of copies of Spurgeon's Sermons, and the pile was graced at the top with a copy of "Graves's Great Iron Wheel," which a Baptist friend presented for the purpose. We trust that the works of the greasy cockney vociferator may receive the same treatment throughout the South. And if the Pharisaical author should ever show himself in these parts, we trust that a stout cord may speedily find its way around his eloquent throat. He has proved himself a dirty low-bred slanderer, and ought to be treated accordingly."

And very recently we have read in the journals, that the trustees of a College in Alabama have resolved that Dr. Wyland's admirable work on Moral Science "contains abolition doctrine of the deepest dye;" and they proceeded to denounce "the said book, and forbid its further use in the Institute."

The speeches of Wilberforce in the British Parliament, and especially those magnificent efforts of Brougham, where he exposed "the wild and guilty fantasy that man can hold property in man," were insanely denounced by the British planters in the West Indies; but our Slave-masters go further. Speeches delivered in the Senate have been stopped at the Post-office; booksellers who had received them have been mobbed, and on at least one occasion the speeches have been solemnly proceeded against by a Grand Jury.

All this is natural, for tyranny is condemned to be consequent with itself. Proclaim Slavery to be a permanent institution, instead of a temporary Barbarism, soon to pass away, and then, by the unhesitating logic of self-preservation, all things must yield to its support. The safety of Slavery becomes the supreme law. And since Slavery is endangered by liberty in any form, therefore all liberty must be restrained. Such is the philosophy of this seeming paradox in a Republic. And our Slave-masters show themselves apt in this work. Violence and brutality are their ready instruments, quickened always by the wakefulness of suspicion, and perhaps often by the restlessness of uneasy conscience. Everywhere in the States the Lion's Mouth of Venice, where citizens were anonymously denounced, is open; nor are the gloomy prisons and the Bridge of Sighs wanting.

This spirit has recently shown itself with such intensity and activity as to constitute what has been properly termed a reign of terror. Northern men, unless they happen to be delegates to a Democratic Convention, are exposed in their travels, whether of business or health, to the operation of this system. They are watched and dogged, as if in a land of Despotism; they are treated with the meanness of a disgusting tyranny, and live in peril always of personal indignity, and often of life and limb. Complaint has sometimes been made of the wrongs to American citizens in Mexico; but during the last year, more outrages on American citizens have been perpetrated in the Slave States than in Mexico. Here, again, I have no time for details, which have been already presented in other quarters. But the instances are from all conditions of life. In Missouri, a Methodist clergyman, suspected of being an Abolitionist, was taken to prison, amidst threat of tar and feathers. In Arkansas, a schoolmaster was driven from the State. In Kentucky, a plain citizen from Indiana, on a visit to his friends, was threatened with death by the rope. In Alabama, a simple person from Connecticut, peddling books, was thrust into prison amidst cries of "Shoot him! hang him!" In Virginia, a Shaker, from New-York, peddling garden seeds, was forcibly expelled from the State. In Georgia, a merchant's clerk, Irishman by birth, who simply asked the settlement of a just debt, was cast into prison, robbed of his pocket-book, containing nearly $100, and barely escaped with his life. In South Carolina, a stone-cutter, Irishman by birth, was stripped naked and then amidst cries of "Brand him!" "Burn him!" "Spike him to death!" scourged so that blood came at every stroke, while tar was poured upon his lacerated flesh These atrocities, calculated, according to the words of a poet of subtle beauty, to "make a holiday in hell," were all ordained, by Vigilance Committees, or by that busiest magistrate, Judge Lynch, inspired by the demon of Slavery.

"He let him loose, and cried, Halloo!
How shall we yield him honor due?"

In perfect shamelessness, and as if to blazon this fiendish spirit, we have had, this winter, in a leading newspaper of Virginia, an article proposing to give twenty-five dollars each for the heads of citizens, mostly members of Congress, known to be against Slavery, and $50,000 for the head of William H. Seward. And in still another paper of Virginia, we find a proposition to raise $10,000 to be given for the kidnapping and delivery of a venerable citizen, Joshua R. Giddings, at Richmond, "or $5,000 for the production of his head." These are fresh instances, but they are not alone. At a meeting of Slave-masters in Georgia, in 1835, the Govenor was recommended to issue a proclamation, offering $5,000 as a reward for the apprehension of *either* of ten persons named in the resolution, citizens of New York and Massachusetts, and one a subject of Great Britain—not one of whom it was pretended had ever set foot on the soil of Georgia. The Milledgeville *Federal Union*, a newspaper of Georgia, in 1836, contained an offer of $10,000 for kidnapping a clergyman residing in the city of New York. A Committee of Vigilance of Louisiana, in 1835, offered in the *Louisiana Journal* $50,000 to any person who would deliver in their hands Arthur Tappan, a merchant of New York; and during the same year, a public meeting in Alabama, with a person entitled "Honorable" in the chair, offered a similar reward of $50,000 for the apprehension of the same Arthur Tappan; and of La Roy Sunderland, a clergyman of the Methodist church at New York.

These manifestations are not without prototype in the history of the Anti-Slavery cause in other countries. From the beginning, Slave-masters have encountered argument by brutality and violence. If we go back to the earliest of Abolitionists, the wonderful Portuguese preacher, Vieyra, we shall find that his matchless eloquence and unquestioned piety did not save him from indignity. After a sermon exposing Slavery in Brazil, he was seized and imprisoned, while one of the principal Slave-masters asked him, in mockery, where were all his learning and all his genius now, if they could not deliver him in this extremity? He was of the Catholic church. But the spirit of Slavery is the same in all churches. A renowned Quaker minister of the last century, Thomas Chalkley, while on a visit at Barbados, having simply recommended charity to the slaves, without presuming to breathe a word against Slavery itself, was first met by disturbance in the meeting, and afterwards, on the highway, and in open day, was fired at by one of the exasperated planters, with "a fowling-piece loaded with small shot, ten of which made marks, and several drew blood." Even in England, while the slave trade was under discussion, the same spirit appeared. Wilberforce, who represented the cause of Abolition in Parliament, was threatened with personal violence; Clarkson, who represented the same cause before the people, was assaulted by the infuriate Slave-traders, and narrowly escaped being hustled into the dock; and Roscoe, the accomplished historian, on his return to Liverpool from his seat in Parliament, where he had signalized himself as an opponent of the slave trade, was met at the entrance of the town by a savage mob, composed of persons interested in this traffic, armed with *knives and bludgeons*, the distinctive arguments and companions of Pro-Slavery partisans.

And even in the Free States, the partisans of Slavery have from the beginning acted under the inspiration of violence. The demon of Slavery has entered into them, and under its influence they have behaved like Slave-masters. Public meetings for the discussion of Slavery have been interrupted; public halls dedicated to its discussion have been destroyed or burned to the ground. In all our populous cities the great rights of speech and of the press have been assailed precisely as in the Slave States. In Boston Garrison, pleading for the Slave, was dragged through the streets with a halter about his neck, and in Illinois Lovejoy, also pleading for the Slave, was ferociously murdered. The former yet lives to speak for himself, while the latter lives in his eloquent brother, the Representative from Illinois in the other House. Thus does Slavery show its natural influence even at a distance.

Nor in the Slave States is this spirit confined to the outbreaks of mere lawlessness. Too strong for restraint, it finds no limitations except in its own barbarous will. The Government becomes its tool, and in *official acts* does its bidding. Here again the instances are numerous. I might dwell on the degradation of the Post Office, when its official head consented that, for the sake of Slavery, the mails themselves should be rifled. I might dwell also on the cruel persecution of Free Persons of color who in the Slave States generally, and even here in the District of Columbia, are not allowed to testify where a white man is in question, and who now in several States are menaced by legislative act with the alternative expulsion from their homes or of reduction to Slavery. But I pass at once to two illustrative transactions, which, as a son of Massachusetts, I cannot forget.

1. The first relates to a citizen, of purest life and perfect integrity, whose name is destined to fill a conspicuous place in the history of Freedom, William Lloyd Garrison. Born in Massachusetts, bred to the same profession with Benjamin Franklin, and like his great predecessor becoming an editor, he saw with instinctive clearness the wrong of Slavery, and at a period when the ardors of the Missouri Question had given way to indifference throughout the North, he stepped forward to denounce it. The jail at Baltimore, where he then resided, was his earliest reward. Afterwards, January 1st, 1831, he published the first number of the *Liberator*, inscribing for his motto an utterance of Christian philanthropy, "My country is the world, my countrymen are all mankind," and declaring in the face of surrounding apathy, "I am in earnest. I will not equivocate, I will not retreat a single inch, and I will be heard." In this sublime spirit he commenced his labors for the Slave, proposing no intervention by Congress in the States, and on well considered principle avoiding all appeals to the bondmen themselves. Such was his simple and thoroughly constitutional position, when, before the expiration of the first year, the Legislature of Georgia, by solemn act, a copy of which I have now before me, "approved" by Wilson Lumpkin, Governor, appropriated $5,000 "to be paid to any person who shall arrest, bring to trial, and prosecute to conviction under the laws of this State, the editor or publisher of a certain paper called the *Liberator*, published at the

town of Boston and State of Massachusetts." This infamous legislative act touching a person absolutely beyond the jurisdiction of Georgia, and in no way amenable to its laws, constituted a plain bribe to the gangs of kidnappers engendered by Slavery. With this barefaced defiance of justice and decency Slave-masters inaugurated the system of violence by which they have sought to crush every voice that has been raised against Slavery.

2. Here is another illustration of a different character. Free persons of color, citizens of Massachusetts, and, according to the institutions of this Commonwealth, entitled to equal privileges with other citizens, being in service as mariners, and touching at the port of Charleston, in South Carolina, have been seized, and with no allegation against them, except of entering this port in the discharge of their rightful business, have been cast into prison, and there detained during the delay of the vessel. This is by virtue of a statute of South Carolina, passed in 1823, which further declares, that in the failure of the captain to pay the expenses, these freemen "shall be seized and taken as absolute slaves," one moiety of the proceeds of their sale to belong to the sheriff. Against all remonstrance—against the official opinion of Mr. Wirt, as Attorney General of the United States, declaring it unconstitutional—against the solemn judgment of Mr. Justice Johnson, of the Supreme Court of the United States, himself a Slave-master and citizen of South Carolina, also pronouncing it unconstitutional—this statute, which is an obvious injury to Northern shipowners, as it is an outrage to the mariners whom it seizes, has been upheld to this day by South Carolina.

But this is not all. Massachusetts, in order to obtain for her citizens that protection which was denied, and especially to save them from the dread penalty of being sold into Slavery, appointed a citizen of South Carolina to act as her agent for this purpose, and to bring suits in the Circuit Court of the United States in order to try the constitutionality of this pretension. Owing to the sensibility of the people in that State, this agent declined to render this simple service. Massachusetts next selected one of her own sons, a venerable citizen, who had already served with honor in the other House of Congress, and who was of admitted eminence as a lawyer, the Hon. Samuel Hoar, of Concord, to visit Charleston, and to do what the agent first appointed had shrunk from doing. This excellent gentleman, beloved by all who knew him, gentle in manners as he was firm in character, and with a countenance that was in itself a letter of recommendation, arrived at Charleston, accompanied only by his daughter. Straightway all South Carolina was convulsed. According to a story in Boswell's Johnson, all the inhabitants at St. Kilda, a remote island of the Hebrides, on the approach of a stranger, "catch cold;" but in South Carolina it is a fever that they "catch." The Governor at the time, who was none other than one of her present Senators, [Mr. HAMMOND,] made his arrival the subject of a special message to the Legislature, which I now have before me; the Legislature all "caught" the fever, and swiftly adopted resolutions calling upon "his Excellency the Governor to expel from its territory the said agent, after due notice to depart," and promising "to sustain the Executive authority in any measures it may adopt for the purpose aforesaid."

Meanwhile the fever raged in Charleston. The agent of Massachusetts was first accosted in the street by a person unknown to him, who, flourishing a bludgeon in his hand—the bludgeon always shows itself where Slavery is in question—cried out, "you had better be traveling, and the sooner the better for you, I can tell you; if you stay here until to-morrow morning, you will feel something you will not like, I'm thinking." Next came threats of an attack during the following night on the Hotel in which he was lodged; then a request from the landlord that he should quit, in order to preserve the Hotel itself from the impending danger of an infuriate mob; then a committee of Slave-masters, who politely proposed to conduct him to the boat. Thus arrested in his simple errand of good will, this venerable public servant, whose appearance alone—like that of the "grave and pious man" mentioned by Virgil—would have softened any mob not inspired by Slavery, yielded to the ejectment proposed—precisely as the prisoner yields to the officers of the law—and left Charleston, while a person in the crowd was heard to offer himself as "the leader of a tar-and-feather gang to be called into the service of the city on the occasion." Nor is this all! The Legislature a second time "caught" the fever, and, yielding to its influence passed another statute, forbidding under severe penalties any person within the State from accepting a commission to befriend these colored mariners, and under penalties severer still extending even to imprisonment for life, prohibiting any person "on his behalf, or by virtue of any authority rom any State," to come within South Carolina for this purpose; and then, to complete its work, the Legislature took away the writ of *habeas corpus* from all such mariners.

Such is a simple narrative founded on authentic documents. I do not adduce it now for criticism, but simply to enroll it in all its stages—beginning with the earliest pretension of South Carolina, continuing in violence, and ending in yet other pretensions—among the special instances where the Barbarism of Slavery stands confessed even in official conduct. And yet this transaction, which may well give to South Carolina the character of a shore "where shipwrecked mariners dread to land," has openly vindicated in all its details from beginning to end by both the Senators from that State, while one of them, [Mr. HAMMOND,] in the same breath, has borne his testimony from personal knowledge to the character of the public agent thus maltreated, saying, "he was a pleasant, kind, old gentleman, and I had a sort of friendship for him during the short time I sat near him in Congress."

Thus, sir, whether we look at individuals or at the community where Slavery exists, at lawless outbreaks or at official conduct, Slave-masters are always the same. Enough, you will say, has been said. Yes; enough to expose Slavery, but not enough for Truth. The most instructive and most grievous part still remains. It is the exhibition of Slave-masters in Congressional history. Of course, the representatives reflects the character as well as the political opinions of the constituents whose will it is his boast to obey. It follows that the passions and habits of Slave-

masters are naturally represented in Congress—chastened to a certain extent, perhaps by the requirements of Parliamentary Law, but breaking out in fearful examples. And here, again, facts shall speak, as nothing else can.

In proceeding with this duty, to which, as you will perceive, I am impelled by the positive requirements of this debate, I crave the indulgence of the Senate, while, avoiding all allusions to private life or private character, and touching simply what is of record, and already "enrolled in the Capitol," I present a few only of many instances, which, especially during these latter days, since Slavery has become paramount, have taken their place in our national history.

Here is an instance. On the 15th February, 1837, R. M. Whitney was arraigned before the House of Representatives for contempt, in refusing to attend, when required, before a Committee of investigation into the administration of the Executive office. His excuse was, that he could not attend without exposing himself thereby to outrage and violence in the committee room; and on examination at the bar of the House, Mr. Fairfield, a member of the Committee, afterwards a member of this body, and Governor of Maine, testified to the actual facts. It appeared that Mr. Peyton, a Slave-master from Tennessee, and a member of the Committee, regarding a certain answer in writing by Mr. Whitney to an interrogatory propounded by him as offensive, broke out in these words: "Mr. Chairman, I wish you to inform the witness, that he is not to insult me in his answers; if he does, God damn him! I will take his life on the spot!" The witness, rising, claimed the protection of the Committee; on which Mr. Peyton exclaimed; "God damn you, you shan't speak; you shan't say one word while you are in this room; if you do, I will put you to death." Mr. Wise, another Slave-master from Virginia, Chairman of the Committee, and latterly Governor of Virginia, then intervened, saying, "Yes, this damned insolence is insufferable." Soon after, Mr. Peyton observing that the witness was looking at him, cried out, "Damn him, his eyes are on me—God damn him, he is looking at me—he shan't do it—damn him, he shan't look at me."

These things, and much more disclosed by Mr. Fairfield in reply to interrogatories in the House, were confirmed by other witnesses, and Mr. Wise himself in a speech made the admission that he was armed with deadly weapons, saying, "I watched the motion of that right arm, [of the witness] the elbow of which could be seen by me, and had it moved one inch, he had died on the spot. That was my determination."

All this will be found in the 13th volume of the *Congressional Debates*, with the evidence in detail, and the discussion thereupon.

Here is another instance of similar character, which did not occur in a Committee-room but during debate in the Senate Chamber. While the Compromise measures were under discussion in 1850, on the 17th of April, 1850, Mr. Foote, a Slave-master from Mississippi, in the course of his remarks, commenced a personal allusion to Mr. Benton. This was aggravated by the circumstance that only a few days previously he had made this distinguished gentleman the mark for most bitter and vindictive personalities. Mr. Benton rose at once from his seat, and, with an angry countenance, but without weapons of any kind in his hand, or as it appeared afterward before the Committee, on his person, advanced in the direction of Mr. Foote, when the latter gliding backwards, drew from his pocket a five-chambered revolver, full loaded, which he cocked. Meanwhile Mr. Benton, at the suggestion of friends, was already returning to his seat, when he perceived the pistol. Excited greatly by this deadly menace, he exclaimed, "I am not armed. I have no pistols. I disdain to carry arms. I have no pistols. Stand out of the way, and let the assassin fire." Mr. Foote remained standing in the position he had taken, with his pistol in his hand, cocked. 'Soon after," says the report of the Committee appointed to investigate this occurrence, "both Senators resumed their seats, and order was restored."

All this will be found at length in the 21st volume of the *Congressional Globe*.

Another instance, which belongs to the same class, is given by the Hon. William Jay, a writer of singular accuracy, and of the truest principle, who has done much to illustrate the history of our country. It is this: Mr. Dawson, a Slave-master from Louisiana, and a member of the House of Representatives, went up to another member on the floor of the House, and addressed to him these words: "If you attempt to speak or rise from your seat, sir, by G—d, I'll cut your throat."

The duel, which at home in the Slave States is "twin" with the "street fight," is also "twin" with these instances. It is constantly adopted or attempted by Slave-masters in Congress. But I shall not enter upon this catalogue. I content myself with showing the openness with which in debate it has been menaced, and without any call to order.

Mr. Foote, the same Slave-master already mentioned, in debate in the Senate, 26th of March, 1850, thus sought to provoke Mr. Benton. I take his words from the *Congressional Globe*, vol. 21, p. 603:

> "There are instances in the history of the Senator which might well relieve a man of honor from the obligation to recognise him as a fitting antagonist; yet it is notwithstanding true, that, if the Senator from Missouri will deign to acknowledge himself *responsible to the laws of honor* he shall have a very early oppportunity of proving his prowess in contest with one over whom I hold perfect control; or if he feels in the least degree aggrieved at anything which has fallen from me, he shall, on demanding it, *have full redress accorded to him*, according to the said laws of honor. I do not denounce him as a coward; such language is unfitted for this audience; but if he wishes to patch up his reputation for courage, now greatly on the wane, he will certainly *have an opportunity of doing so whenever he makes his desire known in the premises.* At present he is shielded by his age, *his open disavowal of the obligatory laws of honor*, and his Senatorial privileges."

With such bitter taunts and reiterated provocations to the duel was Mr. Benton pursued; but there was no call to order, nor any action of the Senate on this outrage.

Here is another instance. In debate in the Senate on the 27th February, 1852, Mr. Clemens, a Slave-master of Alabama, thus directly attacked Mr. Rhett for undertaking to settle their differences by argument in the Senate rather than by the duel. "No man," said he, "with the feeling of a man in his bosom, would have sought redress here. He would have looked for it *elsewhere*. He now comes here not to ask redress in the only way he should have sought it."

There was no call to order.

Here is still another. In the debate of the bill for the improvement of Rivers and Harbors, 29th July, 1854, (*Congressional Globe*, vol. 29, appendix, page 1163,) the Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. BENJAMIN,] who is still a member of this body, ardent for Slavery, while professing to avoid personal altercation in the Senate, especially "with a gentleman who professes the principle of non-resistance, as he understood the Senator from New York does," proceeded most earnestly to repel an imagined imputation on him by Mr. SEWARD, and wound up by saying: "If it came from another quarter, *it would not be upon this floor that I should answer it.*"

And then, during the present session, the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. DAVIS,] who speaks so often for Slavery, in a colloquy on this floor with the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. COLLAMER,] has maintained the Duel as a mode of settling personal differences and vindicating what is called personal honor; as if personal honor did not depend absolutely upon what a man does, and not what is done to him. "A gentleman," says the Senator, "has the right to give an insult, *if he feels himself bound to answer for it;*" and in reply to the Senator from Vermont, he declared, that in case of insult, taking another out and shooting him might be "satisfaction."

I do not dwell on this instance, nor on any of these instances, except to make a single comment. These declarations have all been made in open Senate without any check from the Chair. Of course, they are clear violations of the first principles of Parliamentary Law, and tend directly to provoke a violation of the law of the land. All duels are prohibited by solemn act of Congress. (See Statutes at Large, vol. 5, page 318, February 20, 1839.) In case of death, the surviving parties are declared guilty of felony, to be punished by hard labor in the penitentiary; and, even where nothing has occurred beyond the challenge, all the parties to it, whether givers or receivers, are declared guilty of high crime and misdemeanor, also to be punished by hard labor in the penitentiary. Of course, every menace of a duel in Congress sets this law at defiance. And yet the Senators, who thus openly disregard a law sanctioned by the Constitution and commended by morality, presume to complain on this floor because other Senators disregard the Fugitive Slave Bill, a statute which, according to the profound convictions of large numbers, is as unconstitutional as it is offensive to the moral sense. Let Senators who are so clamorous for "the enforcement of law," begin by enforcing the statute which declares the Duel to be a felony. At least, let the statute cease to be a dead letter in this Chamber. But this is too much to expect while Slavery prevails here, for the Duel is a part of that System of Violence which has its origin in Slavery.

But it is when aroused by the Slave Question in Congress that Slave-masters have most truly shown themselves; and here again I shall speak only of what has already passed into history. Even in that earliest debate, in the First Congress after the Constitution, on the memorial of Dr. Franklin, simply called upon Congress "to step to the verge of its powers to discourage every species of traffic in our fellow men," the Slave-masters became angry, indulged in sneers at "the men in the gallery," being Quakers and Abolitionists, and, according to the faithful historian, Hildreth, poured out "torrents of abuse," while one of them began the charge so often since directed against all Anti Slavery men, by declaring his astonishment that Dr. Franklin had "given countenance to an application which called upon Congress, in explicit terms, to break a solemn compact to which he had himself been a party," when it was obvious that Dr. Franklin had done no such thing. This great man was soon summoned away by death, but not until he had fastened upon this debate an undying condemnation, by portraying, with his matchless pen, a scene at the Divan at Algiers, where a corsair Slave-dealer, insisting upon the enslavement of White Christians, is made to repeat the Congressional speech of an American Slave-master.

But these displays of Violence have naturally increased with the intensity of the discussion. Impelled to be severe, but with little appreciation of the finer forms of debate, they could not be severe except by violating the rules of debate; not knowing that there is a serener power than any found in personalities, and that all severity which transcends the rules of debate, becomes disgusting as the talk of Yahoos, and harms him only who degrades himself to be its mouthpiece. Of course, on such occasions, the cause of Slavery, amidst all seeming triumphs, has lost, and Truth has gained.

It was against John Quincy Adams that this violence was first directed in full force. To a character spotless as snow, and to universal attainments as a scholar, this illustrious citizen added experience in all the eminent posts of the Republic, which he had filled with an ability and integrity, now admitted even by his enemies, and which impartial history cannot forget. Having been President of the United States, he entered the House of Representatives at the period when the Slave Question in its revival first began to occupy the public attention. In all the completeness of his nature, he became the representative of Human Freedom. The first struggle occurred on the right of petition, which Slave-masters, with characteristic tyranny, sought to suppress. This was resisted by the venerable patriot, and what he did was always done with his whole heart. Then was poured upon him abuse *as from a cart.* Slave-masters, "foaming out their shame," became conspicuous, not less for an avowal of sentiments at which Civilization blushed, than for an effrontery of manner where the accidental legislator was lost in the natural overseer, and the lash of the plantation resounded in the voice.

In an address to his constituents, 17th September, 1842, Mr. Adams thus frankly describes the treatment he had experienced:

> "I never can take part in any debate upon an important subject, be it only upon a mere abstraction, but a pack opens upon me of personal invective in return. Language has no word of reproach and railing that is not hurled at me."

And in the same speech he gives a glimpse of Slave-masters:

> "Where the South cannot effect her object by brow-beating, she wheedles."

On another occasion he said, with his accustomed power:

> "Insult, bullying and threat, characterize the Slaveholders in Congress; talk, timidity, and submission, the Representatives from the Free States."

Nor were the Slave-masters contented with the violence of words. True to the instincts of Slavery, they threatened personal indignity of every kind, and even assassination. And here South Carolina naturally took the lead.

The *Charleston Mercury*, which always speaks the true voice of Slavery, said in 1837:

"Public opinion in the South would now, we are sure, justify an immediate resort to force by the Southern delegation, *even on the floor of Congress*, were they forthwith to seize and drag from the Hall any man who dared to insult them, as that eccentric old showman, John Quincy Adams, has dared to do."

And at a public dinner at Walterborough, in South Carolina, on the 4th of July, 1842, the following toast, afterwards preserved by Mr. Adams in one of his speeches, was drunk with unbounded applause:

"May we never want a Democrat to trip up the heels of a Federalist, or a hangman to prepare a halter for John Quincy Adams! [Nine cheers.]"

A Slave-master from South Carolina, Mr. Waddy Thompson, in debate in the House of Representatives, threatened the venerable patriot with the "penitentiary;" and another Slave-master, Mr. Marshall of Kentucky, insisted that he should be "*silenced.*" Ominous word! full of suggestion to the bludgeon-bearers of Slavery. But the great representative of Freedom stood firm. Meanwhile Slavery assumed more and more the part of the giant Maul in the Pilgrim's Progress, who continued with his club breaking the skulls of pilgrims, until he was slain by Mr. Great Heart, making way for the other pilgrims, Mr. Valiant for Truth, Mr. Standfast, and Mr. Honest.

Next to John Quincy Adams, no person in Congress has been more conspicuous for long-continued and patriotic services against Slavery, than Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio; nor have any such services received in higher degree that homage which is found in the personal and most vindictive assaults of Slave-masters. For nearly twenty years he sat in the House of Representatives, bearing his testimony always loftily, and never shrinking, though exposed to the grossest brutality. In a recent public address at New York, he has himself recounted some of these instances.

On the presentation by him of resolutions affirming that Slavery was a local institution, and could not exist outside of the Slave States, and applying this principle to the case of the Creole, the House "caught" the South Carolina fever. A proposition censuring him was introduced by Slave-masters, and pressed to a vote under the operation of the previous question without giving him a moment for explanation, or reply. This glaring outrage upon freedom of debate, was redressed at once by the constituency of Mr. Giddings, who returned him again to his seat. From that time the rage of the Slave-masters against him was constant. Here is his own brief account:

"I will not speak of the time when Dawson, of Louisiana, drew a bowie-knife for my assassination. I was afterwards speaking with regard to a certain transaction in which negroes were concerned in Georgia, when Mr. Black, of Georgia, raising his bludgeon, and standing in front of my seat, said to me, 'If you repeat that language again, I will knock you down.' It was a solemn moment for me. I had never been knocked down, and having some curiosity upon that subject, I repeated the language. Then Mr. Dawson, of Louisiana, the same who had drawn the bowe-knife, placed his hand in his pocket and said, with an oath which I will not repeat, that he would shoot me, at the same time cocking the pistol, so that all around me could hear it click."

Listening to these horrors, ancient stories of Barbarism seem all outdone; and the "viper-broth," which was a favorite decoction in a barbarous age, seems to have become the daily drink of American Slave-masters. The blaspheming madness of the witches in Macbeth, dancing round the cauldron, and dropping into it "sweltered venom sleeping got," and every other "charm of powerful trouble," was all renewed. But Mr. Giddings, strong in the consciousness of right, knew the dignity of his position. He knew that it is honorable always to serve the cause of Liberty, and that it is a privilege to suffer for this cause. Reproach, contumely, violence even unto death, are rewards, not punishments; and clearly the indignities which you offer can excite no shame except for their authors.

Besides these eminent instances, others may be mentioned, showing the personalities to which Senators and representatives have been exposed, when undertaking to speak for Freedom. And truth compels me to add, that there is too much evidence that these have been aggravated by the circumstance that, where persons notoriously rejected an appeal to the Duel, such insults could be offered with impunity.

Here is an instance. In 1848, Mr. HALE, the Senator from New Hampshire, who still continues an honor to this body, introduced into the Senate a bill for the protection of property in the District of Columbia, especially against mob-violence. In the course of the debate that ensued, Mr. Foote, a Slave-master from Mississippi, thus menaced him:

"I invite the Senator to the State of Mississippi, and will tell him beforehand, in all honesty, that he could not go ten miles into the interior before he would grace one of the tallest trees of the forest, with a rope around his neck, with the approbation of every virtuous and patriotic citizen, and that, if necessary, *I should myself assist in the operation.*"

That this bloody threat may not seem to stand alone, I add two others.

Mr. HAMMOND, of South Carolina, now a Senator, is reported as saying in the House of Representatives:

"I warn the abolitionists, ignorant, infatuated barbarians as they are, that if chance shall throw any of them into our hands, they may expect *a felon's death!*"

And in 1841, Mr. Payne, a Slave-master from Alabama, in the course of debate in the House of Representatives, alluding to the Abolitionists, among whom he insisted the Postmaster General ought to be included, declared that—

"He would put the brand of Cain upon them—yes, the mark of hell—and if they came to the South he would *hang them like dogs!*"

And these words were applied to men who simply expressed the recorded sentiments of Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin.

Even during the present session of Congress, I find, in the *Congressional Globe*, the following interruptions of Mr. LOVEJOY, when speaking on Slavery. I do not characterize them; but simply cite them:

By Mr. BARKSDALE, of Mississippi:

"Order that black-hearted scoundrel and nigger-stealing thief to take his seat."

By Mr. BOYCE, of South Carolina, addressing Mr. LOVEJOY:

"Then behave yourself."

By Mr. GARTRELL, of Georgia, (in his seat:)

"The man is crazy."

By Mr. BARKSDALE, of Mississippi, again:

"No, sir, you stand there to-day an infamous, perjured villain."

By Mr. ASHMORE, of South Carolina:

"Yes; he is a perjured villain, and he perjures himself every hour he occupies a seat on this floor."

By Mr. SINGLETON, of Mississippi:

"And a negro-thief into the bargain."

By Mr. BARKSDALE, of Mississippi, again:

"I hope my colleague will hold no parley with that perjured negro-thief."

By Mr. SINGLETON, of Mississippi, again:

"No, sir; any gentleman shall have time, but not such a mean, despicable wretch as that!"

By Mr. MARTIN, of Virginia:

"And if you come among us, we will do with you as we did with John Brown—hang you as high as Haman. I say that as a Virginian."

But enough—enough; and I now turn from this branch of the argument with a single remark. While exhibiting the Character of Slave-masters, these numerous instances — and they might be multiplied indefinitely—attest the weakness of their cause. It requires no special talent to estimate the insignificance of an argument that can be supported only by violence. The scholar will not forget the story told by Lucian of the colloquy between Jupiter and a simple countryman. They talked with ease and freedom until they differed, when the angry god at once menaced his honest opponent with a thunder bolt. "Ah, ah!" said the clown, with perfect composure, "now, Jupiter, I know you are wrong. You are always wrong when you appeal to your thunder." And permit me to say, that every appeal, whether to the Duel, the bludgeon, or the revolver—every menace of personal violence, and every outrage of language, besides disclosing a hideous Barbarism, also discloses the fevered nervousness of a cause already humbled in debate.

(4.) Much as has been said to exhibit the Character of Slave-masters, the work would be incomplete if I failed to point out that *unconsciousness* of the fatal influence of Slavery, which completes the evidence of the Barbarism under which they live. Nor am I at liberty to decline this topic; but I shall be brief.

That Senators should openly declare Slavery "ennobling," at least to the master, and also "the black marble key-stone of our national arch," would excite wonder if it were not explained by the examples of history. There are men, who, in the spirit of paradox, make themselves the partisans of a bad cause, as Jerome Cardan wrote an Encomium on Nero. But where there is no disposition to paradox it is natural that a cherished practice should bind those who are under its influence; nor is there any end to these exaggerations. According to Thucydides, piracy in the early ages of Greece was alike widespread and honorable; so much so that Telemachus and Mentor, on landing at Mycenæ, were asked by Nestor if they were "pirates"—precisely as the stranger in South Carolina might be asked if he were a Slave-master. Kidnapping, too, which was a kindred indulgence, was openly avowed, and I doubt not held to be "ennobling." Next to the unconsciousness which is noticed in childhood, is the unconsciousness of Barbarism. The real Barbarian is as unconscious as an infant; and the Slave-master shows much of the same character. No New Zealander exults in his tattoo, no savage of the Northwest coast exults in his flat head, more than the Slave-master in these latter days—and always, of course, with honorable exceptions—exults in his unfortunate condition. The Slave-master hugs his disgusting practice as the Carib of the Gulf hugged Cannibalism, and as Brigham Young now hugs Polygamy. The delusion of the "Goitre" is repeated. This prodigious swelling of the neck, constituting "a hideous wallet of flesh," pendulous upon the breast, is common to the population on the slopes of the Alps; but, accustomed to this deformity, the sufferer comes to regard it with pride, as Slave-masters with us regard Slavery, and it is said that those who have no swelling are laughed at and called "goose-necked."

With knowledge comes distrust and the modest consciousness of imperfection; but the pride of Barbarism has no such limitations. It dilates in the thin air of ignorance, and makes boasts. Surely, if these illustrations are not entirely inapplicable, then must we find in the boasts of Slave-masters new occasion to regret the influence of Slavery.

It is this same influence which renders Slave-masters insensible to those characters which are among the true glories of the Republic; which makes them forget that Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, and Washington, who commanded its armies, were Abolitionists; which renders them insensible to the inspiring words of the one, and to the commanding example of the other. Of these great men, it is the praise, well deserving perpetual mention, and only grudged by a malign influence, that reared amidst Slavery, they did not hesitate to condemn it To the present debate, Jefferson, in repeated utterances, alive with the fire of genius and truth, has contributed the most important testimony for Freedom ever pronounced in this hemisphere, in words equal to the cause, and Washington, often quoted as a Slave-master, in the solemn dispositions of his last Will and Testament, has contributed an example which is beyond even the words of Jefferson. Do not, sir, call him a Slave-master, who entered into the presence of his Maker only as the Emancipator of his slaves. The difference between such men and the Slave-masters whom I expose to-day is so precise that it cannot be mistaken. The first *look down* upon Slavery; the second *look up* to Slavery. The first, recognizing its wrong, were at once liberated from its pernicious influences, while the latter, upholding it as right and "ennobling," must naturally draw from it motives of conduct. The first, conscious of the character of Slavery, were not misled by it; the second, dwelling in unconsciousness of its true character, surrender blindly to its barbarous tendencies, and verifying the words of the poet,

> ——"So perfect is their misery,
> Not once perceived their foul disfigurement,
> But boast themselves more comely than before."

Mr. President, it is time to close this branch of the argument. The Barbarism of Slavery has been now exposed, first, in the Law of Slavery, with its five pretensions, founded on the assertion of property in man, the denial of the conjugal relation, the infraction of the parental

relation, the exclusion from knowledge, and the robbery of the fruits of another's labor, all these having the single object of *compelling men to work without wages*, while its Barbarism was still further attested by tracing the law in its origin to barbarous Africa; and secondly, it has been exposed in a careful examination of the economical results of Slavery, illustrated by a contrast between the Free States and the Slave States, sustained by official figures. From this exposure of Slavery, I proceeded to consider its influences on Slave-masters; whose true character stands confessed, first, in the Law of Slavery, which is their work; next, in the relations between them and their slaves, maintained by three inhuman instruments; next, in their relations with each other, and with society, and here we have seen them at home under the immediate influence of Slavery—also in the communities of which they are a part—practicing violence, and pushing it everywhere, in street fight and duel; especially raging against all who question the pretensions of Slavery; entering even into the Free States; but not in lawless outbreaks only; also in official acts, as of Georgia and of South Carolina, with regard to two Massachusetts citizens; and then, ascending in audacity, entering the Halls of Congress, where they have raged as at home, against all who set themselves against their assumptions, while the whole gloomy array of unquestionable facts has been closed by portraying the melancholy unconsciousness which constitutes one of the distinctive features of this Barbarism.

Such is my answer to the assumption of fact in behalf of Slavery by Senators on the other side. But before passing to that other assumption of constitutional law, which constitutes the second branch of this discussion, I add testimony to the influence of Slavery on Slave-masters in other countries, which is too important to be neglected, and may properly find a place here.

Among those who have done most to press forward in Russia that sublime act of emancipation by which the present Emperor is winning lustre, not only for his country, but for our age, is M. Tourgueneff. Originally a Slave-master, himself, with numerous slaves, and residing where Slavery prevailed, he saw, with the instincts of a noble character, the essential Barbarism of this relation, and in an elaborate work on Russia, which is now before me, he exposed it with rare ability and courage. Thus he speaks of its influence on Slave-masters:

"But if Slavery degrades the slave, it degrades more the master. This is an old adage, and long observations have proved to me that this adage is not a paradox. In fact, how can that man respect his own dignity, his own rights, who has learned not to respect either the rights or the dignity of his fellow-man? What control can the moral and religious sentiments have over a man who sees himself invested with a power so eminently contrary to morals and religion? The continual exercise of an unjust claim, even when it is moderated, finishes by corrupting the character of the man and spoiling his judgment. * * * The possession of a slave being the result of injustice, the relations of the master with the slave cannot be otherwise than a succession of injustices. Among good masters (and it is agreed to call so those who do not abuse their power as much as they might) these relations are clothed with forms less repugnant than among others; but here the difference stops. No one could remain always pure, when carried away by his disposition, excited by his temper, drawn by caprice, he can with impunity oppress, insult, humiliate his fellows. And, let it be carefully remarked, that intelligence, civilization, do not avail. The enlightened man, the civilized man, is none the less a man; that he should not oppress, it is necessary that it should be impossible for him to oppress. All men cannot, like Louis XIV, throw their stick from the window, when they feel a desire to strike."—*La Russie et Les Russes, vol. II, pages* 157-'8.

Another authority, unimpeachable at all points, whose fortune it has been, from extensive travels, to see Slavery in the most various forms, and Slave-masters under the most various conditions—I refer to the great African traveller, Dr. Livingstone—thus touches the character of Slave-masters:

"I can never cease to be unfeignedly thankful that I was not born in a land of slaves. No one can understand the unutterable meanness of the slave system on the minds of those who, *but for the strange obliquity which prevents them from feeling the degradation of not being gentlemen enough to pay for services rendered*, would be equal in virtue to ourselves. Fraud becomes as natural to them 'as paying one's way' is to the rest of mankind."—*Livingstone's Travels, chap.* 1, *page* 33.

Thus does the experience of Slavery in other countries confirm the sad experience among us.

Second Assumption.—Discarding now all the presumptuous boasts for Slavery, and bearing in mind its essential Barbarism, I come to consider that second assumption of Senators on the other side, which is, of course, inspired by the first, even if not its immediate consequence, that, under the Constitution, Slave-masters may take their slaves into the national Territories, and there continue to hold them, as at home in the Slave States; and that this would be the case in any territory newly acquired, by purchase or by war, as of Mexico on the South, or Canada on the North.

And here I begin by the remark, that as the assumption of constitutional law is inspired by the assumption of fact with regard to the "ennobling" character of Slavery, so it must lose much if not all of its force when the latter assumption is shown to be false, as has been done to-day.

When Slavery is seen to be the Barbarism which it is, there are few who would not cover it from sight, rather than insist upon sending it abroad with the flag of the Republic. It is only because people have been insensible to its true character that they have tolerated for a moment its exorbitant pretensions. Therefore this long exposition, where Slavery has been made to stand forth in its five-fold Barbarism, with the single object of compelling men to work without wages, naturally prepares the way to consider the assumption of constitutional law.

This assumption may be described as an attempt to *Africanize* the Constitution, by introducing into it the barbarous Law of Slavery, derived as we have seen originally from barbarous Africa; and then, through such *Africanization* of the Constitution, to *Africanize* the Territories, and to *Africanize* the National Government. In using this language to express the obvious effect of this assumption, I borrow a suggestive term, first employed by a Portuguese writer at the beginning of this century, when protesting against the spread of Slavery in Brazil. (*See Koster's Travels in Brazil*, vol. ii, p. 248.) Analyze the assumption, and it will be found to stand on two pretensions, either of which failing the assumption fails also. These two are—first, the African pretension of property in man; and, secondly, the pretension that such property is recognized in the Constitution.

With regard to the first of the pretensions, I

might simply refer to what I have already said at an earlier stage of this argument. But I should do injustice to the part it has been made to play in this controversy, if I did not again expose it. Then I sought particularly to show its Barbarism; now I shall show something more.

Property implies an owner and a thing owned. On the one side is a human being, and on the other side a thing. But the very idea of a human being necessarily excludes the idea of property in that being, just as the very idea of a thing necessarily excludes the idea of a human being. It is clear that a thing cannot be a human being, and it is equally clear that a human being cannot be a thing. And the law itself, when it adopts the phrase, "relation of master and slave," confesses its reluctance to sanction the claim of property. It shrinks from the pretension of Senators, and satisfies itself with a formula which does not openly degrade human nature.

If this property does exist, out of what title is it derived? Under what ordinance of Nature or of Nature's God is one human being stamped an owner and another stamped a thing? God is no respecter of persons. Where is the sanction for this respect of certain persons to a degree which becomes outrage to other persons? God is the Father of the Human Family, and we are all his children. Where then is the sanction of this pretension by which a brother lays violent hands upon a brother? To ask these questions is humiliating; but it is clear there can be but one response. There is no sanction for such pretension; no ordinance for it, or title. On all grounds of reason, and waiving all questions of "positive" statute, the Vermont Judge was nobly right, when, rejecting the claim of a Slave-master, he said: "No; not until you show a Bill of Sale from the Almighty." Nothing short of this impossible link in the chain of title would do. I know something of the great judgments by which the jurisprudence of our country has been illustrated; but I doubt if there is anything in the wisdom of Marshall, the learning of Story, or the completeness of Kent, which will brighten with time like this honest decree.

The intrinsic feebleness of this pretension is apparent in the intrinsic feebleness of the arguments by which it is maintained. These are twofold, and both have been put forth in recent debate by the Senator from Mississippi. [Mr. DAVIS.]

The first is the alleged inferiority of the African race; an argument which, while surrendering to Slavery a whole race, leaves it uncertain whether the same principle may not be applied to other races, as to the polished Japanese, who are now the guests of the nation, and even to persons of obvious inferiority in the white race. Indeed, the latter pretension is openly made in other quarters. The *Richmond Enquirer*, a leading journal of Slave-masters, declares, "The principle of Slavery is in itself right, and *does not depend on difference of complexion.*" And a leading writer among Slave-masters, George Fitzhugh, of Virginia, in his *Sociology for the South*, declares, "Slavery, *black or white*, is right and necessary. Nature has made the weak in mind or body for slaves." And in the same vein a Democratic paper of South Carolina has said, "Slavery is the natural and normal condition of the laboring man, *white or black.*"

These more extravagant pretensions reveal still further the feebleness of the pretension put forth by the Senator; while instances accumulating constantly, attest the difficulty of discriminating between the two races. Mr. Paxton, of Virginia, tells us, that "the best blood in Virginia flows in the veins of the slave;" and fugitive slaves have been latterly advertised as possessing "a round face," "blue eyes," "flaxen hair," and as "escaping under the pretence of being a white man."

This is not the time to enter upon the great question of race, in the various lights of religion, history, and science. Sure I am that they who understand it best, will be least disposed to the pretension, which on the assumed ground of inferiority would condemn one race to be the property of another. If the African race be inferior, as is alleged, then is it the unquestionable duty of a Christian Civilivation to lift it from its degradation, not by the bludgeon and the chain, not by this barbarous pretension of ownership; but by a generous charity, which shall be measured precisely by the extent of its inferiority.

The second argument put forward for this pretension, and twice repeated by the Senator from Mississippi, is, that the Africans are the posterity of Ham, the son of Noah through Canaan, who was cursed by Noah, to be the "servant"—that is the word employed—of his brethern, and that this malediction has fallen upon all his descendants, who are accordingly devoted by God to perpetual bondage, and not only in the third and fourth generations, but throughout all succeeding time. Surely, when the Senator quoted Scripture to enfore the claim of Slave-masters he did not intend a jest. And yet it is hard to suppose him in earnest. The Senator is Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, in which he is doubtless experienced. He may, perhaps, set a squadron in the field, but he has evidently considered very little the text of Scripture on which he relies. The Senator assumes, that it has fixed the doom of the colored race, leaving untouched the white race. Perhaps he does not know that, in the worst days of the Polish aristocracy, this same argument was adopted as the excuse for holding white serfs in bondage precisely as it is now put forward by the Senator, and that even to this day the angry Polish noble addresses his white peasant as the "son of Ham."

It hardly comports with the gravity of this debate to dwell on such an argument, and yet I cannot go wrong if, for the sake of a much-injured race, I brush it away. To justify the Senator in his application of this ancient curse, he must maintain at least five different propositions, as essential links in the chain of the Afric-American slave: *first*, that by this malediction, Canaan himself was actually changed into a "chattel," whereas he is simply made the "servant" of his brethren; *secondly*, that not merely Canaan, but all his posterity, to the remotest generation, was so changed, whereas the language has no such extent; *thirdly*, that the Afric-American actually belongs to the posterity of Canaan—an ethnological assumption absurdly difficult to establish; *fourthly*, that each of the descendants of Shem and Japheth has a right to hold an Afric-American fellow-man as a "chattel"—a proposition which finds no semblance of support; and *fifthly*, that every Slave-master is truly descended from Shem or Japheth—a pedigree which no

anxiety can establish! This plain analysis, which may fitly excite a smile, shows the five-fold absurdity of an attempt to found this pretension on

> "Any successive title, long and dark,
> Drawn from the mouldy rolls of Noah's ark."

From the character of these two arguments for property in man, I am brought again to its denial.

It is natural that Senators who pretend that, by the law of nature, man may hold property in man, should find this pretension in the Constitution. But the pretension is as much without foundation in the Constitution as it is without foundation in nature. It is not too much to say that there is not one sentence, phrase, or word—not a single suggestion, hint, or equivocation, even—out of which any such pretension can be implied; while great national acts and important contemporaneous declarations in the Convention which framed the Constitution, in different forms of language, and also controlling rules of interpretation, render this pretension impossible. Partisans, taking counsel of their desires, find in the Constitution, as in the Scriptures, what they incline to find; and never was this more apparent than when Slave-masters deceive themselves so far as to find in the Constitution a pretension which exists only in their own souls.

Looking juridically for one moment at this question, we shall be brought to the conclusion, according to the admission of courts and jurists, first in Europe, and then in our own country, that Slavery can be derived from no doubtful word or mere pretension, but only from clear and special recognition. "The state of Slavery," said Lord Mansfield, pronouncing judgment in the great case of Somersett, "is of such a nature that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons, moral or political, but only by *positive law*. It is so odious, that nothing can be suffered to support it but POSITIVE LAW"—that is, express words of a written text; and this principle which commends itself to the enlightened reason, has been adopted by several courts in the Slave States. Of course, every leaning must be against Slavery. A pretension so peculiar and offensive—so hostile to reason—so repugnant to the laws of nature and the inborn Rights of Man; which, in all its five-fold wrong, has no other object than to compel fellow-men to work without wages; such a pretension so tyrannical, so unjust, so mean, so barbarous, can find no place in any system of Government, unless by virtue of *positive sanction*. It can spring from no doubtful phrases. It must be declared by unambiguous words, incapable of a double sense.

At the adoption of the Constitution, this rule, promulgated in the Court of King's Bench, by the voice of the most finished magistrate in English history, was as well known in our country as any principle of the common law; especially was it known to the eminent lawyers in the Convention; nor is it too much to say that the Constitution was framed with this rule on Slavery as a guide. And the Supreme Court of the United States at a later day, in the case of *United States* v. *Fisher*, 2 Cranch, 390, by the voice of Chief Justice Marshall, promulgated this same rule, in words stronger even than those of Lord Mansfield, saying: "Where rights are infringed, where fundamental principles are overthrown, where the general system of the laws is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with *irresistible clearness*, to induce a court of justice to suppose a design to effect such object." It is well known, however, that these two declarations are little more than new forms for the ancient rule of the common law, as expressed by Fortescue: *Impius et crudelis judicandus est qui Libertati non favet;* He is to be adjudged impious and cruel who does not favor Liberty; and, as expressed by Blackstone, "The law is always ready to catch at anything in favor of Liberty."

But, as no prescription runs against the King, so no prescription is allowed to run against Slavery, while all the early victories of Freedom are set aside by the Slave-masters of to-day. The prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Territory, and all the precedents, legislative and judicial, for the exercise of this power, admitted from the beginning until now, have been overturned; but at last, bolder grown, Slave-masters do not hesitate to assail that principle of jurisprudence which makes Slavery the creature of "positive law" alone, to be upheld only by words of "irresistible clearness." The case of *Somersett*, in which this great rule was declared, has been impeached on this floor, as the Declaration of Independence has been impeached also. And here the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BENJAMIN] has taken the lead. He has dwelt on the assertion that, in the history of English law, there were earlier cases, where a contrary principle was declared. But permit me to say that no such cases, even if they exist in authentic reports, can impair the influence of this well-considered authority. The Senator knows well that an old and barbarous case is a poor answer to a principle, which is brought into activity by the demands of an advancing Civilization, and which once recognized can never be denied; that jurisprudence is not a dark lantern, shining in a narrow circle, and never changing, but a gladsome light, which, slowly emerging from original darkness, grows and spreads with human improvement, until at last it becomes as broad and general as the Light of Day. When the Senator, in this age—leaguing all his forces—undertakes to drag down that immortal principle, which made Slavery impossible in England, as, thank God! it makes Slavery impossible under the Constitution, he vainly tugs to drag down a luminary from the sky.

The enormity of the pretension that Slavery is sanctioned by the Constitution becomes still more apparent, when we read the Constitution in the light of great national acts and of contemporaneous declarations. First comes the Declaration of Independence, the illuminated initial letter of our history, which in familiar words announces that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are Life, *Liberty*, and the Pursuit of Happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Nor does this Declaration, binding the consciences of all who enjoy the privileges it secured, stand alone. There is another national act, less known, but in itself a key to the first, when, at the successful close of the Revolution, the Continental Congress, in a solemn address to the people, loftily announced: "Let it be remembered, that it has ever been the pride and the boast of America, *that the rights*

for which she has contended were the rights of human nature By the blessing of the Author of *these rights*, they have prevailed over all opposition, and form THE BASIS of thirteen independent States." Now, whatever may be the privileges of States in their individual capacities, within their several local jurisdictions, no power can be attributed to the nation, in the absence of positive unequivocal grant, inconsistent with these two national declarations. Here is the national heart, the national soul, the national will, the national voice, which must inspire our interpretation of the Constitution, and enter into and diffuse itself through all the national legislation. Such are the commanding authorities which constitute "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness," and in more general words, "the Rights of Human Nature," without distinction of race, or recognition of the curse of Ham, as the basis of our national institutions. They need no additional support.

But, in strict harmony with these are the many utterances in the Convention which framed the Constitution: of Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, who announced that "*he would never concur in upholding domestic Slavery;* it was a nefarious institution;" of Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, who said "that we had nothing to do with the conduct of the States as to Slavery, *but we ought to be careful not to give any sanction to it;*" of Roger Sherman and Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, and Mr. Gorham, of Massachusetts, who all concurred with Mr. Gerry; and especially of Mr. Madison, of Virginia, who, in mild juridical phrase, "THOUGHT IT WRONG TO ADMIT IN THE CONSTITUTION THE IDEA THAT THERE COULD BE PROPERTY IN MAN." And lastly, as if to complete the elaborate work of Freedom, and to give expression to all these utterances, the word "servitude," which had been allowed in the clause on the apportionment of Representatives, was struck out, and the word "service" substituted instead. This final exclusion from the Constitution of the idea of property in man was on the motion of Mr. Randolph, of Virginia; and the reason assigned for the substitution, according to Mr. Madison, in his authentic report of the debate, was, that "the former was thought to express the condition of slaves, and the latter *the obligations of free persons.*" Thus, at every point, by great national declarations, by frank utterances in the Convention, and by a positive act in adjusting the text of the Constitution, was the idea of property in man unequivocally rejected.

This pretension, which may be dismissed as utterly baseless, becomes absurd when it is considered to what result it necessarily conducts. If the Barbarism of Slavery, in all its five-fold wrong, is really embodied in the Constitution, so as to be beyond the reach of prohibition, either Congressional or local, in the Territories, then, for the same reason, it must be beyond the reach of prohibition or abolition, even by local authority in the States themselves, and, just so long as the Constitution continues unchanged, Territories and States alike must be open to all its blasting influences. And yet this pretension, which, in its natural consequences, overturns State Rights, is put forward by Senators who profess to be the special guardians of State Rights.

Nor does this pretension derive any support from the much-debated clause in the Constitution for the rendition of fugitives from "service or labor," on which so much stress is constantly put. But I do not occupy your time now on this head, for two reasons—first, because, having already on a former occasion exhibited with great fullness the character of that clause, I am unwilling now thus incidentally to open the question upon it; and secondly, because, whatever may be its character—admitting that it confers power upon Congress—and admitting also, what is often denied, that, in defiance of commanding rules of interpretation, the equivocal words there employed have that "irresistible clearness" which is necessary in taking away Human Rights—yet nothing can be clearer than that the fugitives, whosoever they may be, are regarded under the Constitution as *persons*, and not as *property.*

I disdain to dwell on that other argument, brought forward by Senators, who, denying the Equality of Man, speciously assert the Equality of the States; and from this principle, true in many respects, jump to the conclusion, that Slave-masters are entitled, in the name of Equality, to take their slaves into the National Territories, under the solemn safeguards of the Constitution. But this argument comes back to the first pretension, that slaves are recognised as "property" in the Constitution. To that pretension, already amply exposed, we are always brought, nor can any sounding allegations of State Equality avoid it. And yet, this very argument betrays the inconsistency of its authors. If persons held to service in the Slave States are "property" under the Constitution, then, under the provision—known as the "three-fifths" rule—which founds representation in the other House on such persons, there is a *property representation* from the Slave States, with voice and vote, while there is no such *property representation* from the Free States. With glaring inequality, the representation of Slave States is founded first on "persons," and secondly on a large part of their pretended property; while the representation of the Free States is founded simply on "persons," leaving all their boundless millions of property unrepresented. Thus, whichever way we approach it, the absurdity of this pretension becomes manifest. Assuming the pretension of property in man under the Constitution, you slap in the face the whole theory of State Equality, for you disclose a gigantic inequality between the Slave States and the Free States; and assuming the Equality of States, in the House of Representatives as elsewhere, you slap in the face the whole pretension of property in man under the Constitution.

I disdain to dwell also on that other argument, which, in the name of Popular Sovereignty, undertakes to secure to the people in the Territories the wicked power—sometimes called, by confusion of terms, right—to enslave their fellow-men; as if this pretension was not blasted at once by the Declaration of Independence, when it announced that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and as if anywhere within the jurisdiction of the Constitution, which contains no sentence, phrase or word, sanctioning this outrage, and which carefully excludes the idea of property in man, while it surrounds all persons with the highest safeguards of a citizen, such pretension could exist. Whatever it may be elsewhere, Popular Sovereignty within the sphere of the Constitution has

its limitations. Claiming for all the largest liberty of a true Civilization, it compresses all within the constraints of Justice; nor does it allow any man to assert a right to do what he pleases, except when he pleases to do right. As well within the Territories attempt to make a King as attempt to make a slave. But this pretension—rejected alike by every Slave-master and by every lover of Freedom—

> Where I behold a factious band agree
> To call it freedom when themselves are free,

proceeding originally from a vain effort to avoid the impending question between Freedom and Slavery—assuming a delusive phrase of Freedom as a cloak for Slavery— speaking with the voice of Jacob while its hands are the hands of Esau—and, by its plausible nick-name, enabling politicians sometimes to deceive the public and sometimes even to deceive themselves—may be dismissed with the other kindred pretensions for Slavery, while the Senator from Illinois, [Mr. Douglas,] who, if not its inventor, has been its boldest defender, will learn that Slave-masters for whom he has done so much cannot afford to be generous; that their gratitude is founded on what they expect, and not on what they have received; and, that having its root in desire rather than in fruition, it necessarily withers and dies with the power to serve them. The Senator, revolving these things in his mind, may confess the difficulty of his position, and, perhaps,

> ———remember Milo's end,
> Wedged in that Timber which he strove to rend.

And here I close this branch of the argument, which I have treated less fully than the first, partly because time and strength fail me, but chiefly because the Barbarism of Slavery, when fully established, supersedes all other inquiry. But enough has been done on this head. At the risk of repetition, I now gather it together. The assumption that Slave-masters, under the Constitution, may take their slaves into the Territories, and continue to hold them as in the States, stands on two pretensions—first that man may hold property in man, and secondly that this property is recognized in the Constitution. But we have seen that the pretended property in man stands on no reason, while the two special arguments by which it has been asserted, first an alleged inferiority of race, and secondly the ancient curse of Ham, are grossly insufficient to uphold such a pretension. And we have next seen that this pretension has as little support in the Constitution as in reason; that Slavery is of such an offensive character, that it can find support only in "positive" sanction, and words of "irresistible clearness;" that this benign rule, questioned in the Senate, is consistent with the principles of an advanced civilization; that no such "positive" sanction, in words of "irresistible clearness," can be found in the Constitution, while, in harmony with the Declaration of Independence, and the Address of the Continental Congress, the contemporaneous declarations in the Convention, and especially the act of the Convention in substituting "service" for "servitude," on the ground that the latter expressed "the condition of slaves," all attest that the pretension that man can hold property in man was carefully, scrupulously, and completely excluded from the Constitution, so that it has no semblance of support in that sacred text; nor is this pretension, which is unsupported in the Constitution, helped by the two arguments, one in the name of State Equality, and the other in the name of Popular Sovereignty, both of which are properly put aside.

Sir, the true principle, which reversing the assumptions of Slave-masters, makes Freedom *national* and Slavery *sectional*, while every just claim of the Slave States is harmonized with the irresistible predominance of Freedom under the Constitution, has been declared at Chicago. Not questioning the right of each State, whether South Carolina or Turkey, Virginia or Russia, to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, the Convention there assembled has explicitly announced Freedom to be "the normal condition of all the Territory of the United States," and has explicitly denied "the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to Slavery in any Territory of the United States." Such is the triumphant response, by the aroused millions of the North, alike to the assumption of Slave-masters that the Constitution, of its own force, carries Slavery into the Territories, and also to the device of politicians, that the people of the Territories, in the exercise of a dishonest Popular Sovereignty, may plant Slavery there. This response is complete at all points, whether the Constitution acts upon the Territories before their organization or only afterward; for, in the absence of a Territorial Government, there can be no "positive" law in words of "irresistible clearness" for Slavery, as there can be no such law, when a Territorial Government is organized, under the Constitution. Thus the normal condition of the Territories is confirmed by the Constitution, which when extended over them, renders Slavery impossible, while it writes upon the soil and engraves upon the rock everywhere the law of impartial Freedom, without distinction of color or race.

Mr. President, this argument is now closed. Pardon me for the time I have occupied. It is long since I have made any such claim upon your attention. Pardon me, also, if I have said anything which I ought not to have said. I have spoken frankly, and from the heart; if severely, yet only with the severity of a sorrowful candor, calling things by their right names, and letting historic facts tell their unimpeachable story. I have spoken in the patriotic hope of contributing to the welfare of my country, and also in the assured conviction that what I have said will find a response in generous souls. I believe that I have said nothing which is not sustained by well-founded argument or well-founded testimony, nothing which can be controverted without a direct assault upon reason or upon truth.

The two assumptions of Slave-masters have been answered. But this is not enough. Let the answer become a legislative act, by the admission of Kansas as a Free State. Then will the Barbarism of Slavery be repelled, and the pretension of property in man be rebuked. Such an act, closing this long struggle by the assurance of peace to the Territory, if not of tranquillity to the whole country, will be more grateful still as the herald of that better day, near at hand, when Freedom shall be installed everywhere under the National Government; when the National Flag

wherever it floats, on sea or land within the national jurisdiction, will not cover a single slave; and when the Declaration of Independence, now reviled in the name of Slavery, will once again be reverenced as the American Magna Charta of Human Rights. Nor is this all. Such an act will be the first stage in those triumphs by which the Republic—lifted in character so as to become an example to mankind—will enter at last upon its noble "prerogative of teaching the nations how to live."

Thus, sir, speaking for Freedom in Kansas, I have spoken for Freedom everywhere, and for Civilization; and, as the less is contained in the greater, so are all arts, all sciences, all economies, all refinements, all charities, all delights of life, embodied in this cause. You may reject it; but it will be only for to-day. The sacred animosity between Freedom and Slavery can end only with the triumph of Freedom. This same Question will be soon carried before that high tribunal, supreme over Senate and Court, where the judges will be counted by millions, and where the judgment rendered will be the solemn charge of an aroused people, instructing a new President, in the name of Freedom, to see that Civilization receives no detriment.

APPENDIX.

When Mr. SUMNER resumed his seat, Mr. CHESNUT, of South Carolina, spoke as follows:

Mr. President, after the extraordinary though characteristic speech just uttered in the Senate, it is proper that I assign the reason for the position we are now inclined to assume. After ranging over Europe, crawling through the back-doors to whine at the feet of British aristocracy, craving pity, and reaping a rich harvest of contempt, the slanderer of States and men reappears in the Senate. We had hoped to be relieved from the outpouring of such vulgar malice. We had hoped that one who had felt, though ignominiously he failed to meet, the consequences of a former insolence, would have become wiser, if not better, by experience. In this I am disappointed, and I regret it. Mr. President, in the heroic ages of the world, men were deified for the possession and the exercise of some virtues —wisdom, truth, justice, magnanimity, courage. In Egypt, also, we know they deified beasts and reptiles; but even that bestial people worshipped their idols on account of some supposed virtue. It has been left for this day, for this country, for the Abolitionists of Massachusetts, *to deify the incarnation of malice, mendacity, and cowardice.* Sir, we do not intend to be guilty of aiding in the apotheosis of pusillanimity and meanness. We do not intend to contribute, by any conduct on our part, to increase the devotees at the shrine of this new idol. We know what is expected and what is desired. *We are not inclined again to send forth the recipient of* PUNISHMENT *howling through the world, yelping fresh cries of slander and malice. These are the reasons*, which I feel it due to myself and others to give the Senate and the country, why we have quietly listened to what has been said, and why we can take no other notice of the matter.

In these words, Mr. CHESNUT refers to the assault upon Mr. SUMNER with a bludgeon on the floor of the Senate, by a Representative from South Carolina, since dead, aided by another Representative from that same State, and also a Representative from Virginia, on account of which Mr. SUMNER had been compelled to leave his seat vacant, and seek the restoration of his health by travel. As Mr. CHESNUT spoke, he was surrounded by the Slave-masters of the Senate, who seemed to approve what he said. There was no call to order by the Chair, which was occupied at the time by Mr. BIGLER, of Pennsylvania, Mr. SUMNER obtained the floor with difficulty, while a motion was pending for the postponement of the question, and said:

Mr. President, before this question passes away I think I ought to make (though perhaps there is no occasion for it) a response to the Senator from South Carolina. ["No!" from several Senators.] Only one word. I exposed to-day the *Barbarism of Slavery.* What the Senator has said in reply to me, I may well print in an Appendix to my speech as an additional illustration. That is all.

Mr, HAMMOND, of South Carolina, said:

I hope he will do it.

The following letter, from a venerable citizen, an ornament of our legislative halls at the beginning of the century, and now the oldest survivor of all who have ever been members of Congress, is too valuable, in its testimony and its counsel, to be omitted in its place:

BOSTON, *June* 5, 1860.

DEAR SIR: I have read a few abstracts from your noble speech, but must wait for it in a pamphlet form that I may read it in such type as eyes, in the eighty-ninth year of their age, will permit. But I have read enough to approve and rejoice that you have been permitted, thus truly, fully and faithfully, to expose the "Barbarism" of Slavery on that very floor, on which you were so cruelly and brutally stricken down by the spirit of that Barbarism.

I only hope that in an Appendix you will preserve the *vera effigies* of that insect that attempted to sting you. Remember that the value of amber is increased by the insect it preserves. Yours, very truly,

JOSIAH QUINCY.

THE

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

Resolved, That we, the delegated representatives of the Republican electors of the United States, in Convention assembled, in discharge of the duty we owe to our constituents and our country, unite in the following declarations:

1. That the history of the nation during the last four years has fully established the propriety and necessity of the organization and perpetuation of the Republican party, and that the causes which called it into existence are permanent in their nature, and now, more than ever before, demand its peaceful and constitutional triumph.

2. That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution—"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed"—is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions; and that the Federal Constitution, the Rights of the States, and the Union of the States, must and shall be preserved.

3. That to the Union of the States this nation owes its unprecedented increase in population, its surprising development of material resources, its rapid augmentation of wealth, its happiness at home and its honor abroad, and we hold in abhorrence all schemes for Disunion, come from whatever source they may: and we congratulate the country that no Republican Member of Congress has uttered or countenanced the threats of Disunion so often made by Democratic Members, without rebuke and with applause from their political associates; and we denounce those threats of Disunion, in case of a popular overthrow of their ascendancy, as denying the vital principles of a free government, and as an avowal of contemplated treason which it is the imperative duty of an indignant people sternly to rebuke and forever silence.

4. That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of powers on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

5. That the present Democratic Administration has far exceeded our worst apprehensions, in its measureless subserviency to the exactions of a sectional interest, as especially evinced in its desperate exertions to force the infamous Lecompton Constitution upon the protesting people of Kansas; in construing the personal relation between master and servant to involve an unqualified property in persons; in its attempted enforcement, everywhere, on land and sea, through the intervention of Congress and of the Federal Courts, of the extreme pretensions of a purely local interest; and in its general and unvarying abuse of the power entrusted to it by a confiding people.

6. That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal Government; that a return to rigid economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the systematic plunder of the public treasury by favored partisans; while the recent startling developments of frauds and corruptions at the Federal Metropolis, show that an entire change of administration is imperatively demanded.

7. That the new dogma that the Constitution, of its own force, carries slavery into any or all of the Territories of the United States, is a dangerous political heresy, at

variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself, with cotemporaneous exposition, and with legislative and judicial precedent; is revolutionary in its tendency, and subversive of the peace and harmony of the country.

8. That the normal condition of all the territory of the United States is that of freedom; that, as our republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that "no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law," it becomes our duty, by legislation, whenever such legislation is necessary, to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it; and we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States.

9. That we brand the recent reopening of the African slave-trade, under the cover of our national flag, aided by perversions of judicial power, as a crime against humanity and a burning shame to our country and age; and we call upon Congress to take prompt and efficient measures for the total and final suppression of that execrable traffic.

10. That in the recent vetoes, by their Federal Governors, of the acts of the Legislatures of Kansas and Nebraska prohibiting slavery in those Territories, we find a practical illustration of the boasted Democratic principle of Non-Intervention and Popular Sovereignty embodied in the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and a demonstration of the deception and fraud involved therein.

11. That Kansas should, of right, be immediately admitted as a State under the Constitution recently formed and adopted by her people, and accepted by the House of Representatives.

12. That, while providing revenue for the support of the general government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the working men liberal wages, to agriculture remunerating prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence.

13. That we protest against any sale or alienation to others of the public lands held by actual settlers, and against any view of the Free Homestead policy which regards the settlers as paupers or suppliants for public bounty; and we demand the passage by Congress of the complete and satisfactory Homestead measure which has already passed the House.

14. That the Republican party is opposed to any change in our Naturalization Laws or any State legislation by which the rights of citizenship hitherto accorded to immigrants from foreign lands shall be abridged or impaired; and in favor of giving a full and efficient protection to the rights of all classes of citizens, whether native or naturalized, both at home and abroad.

15. That appropriations by Congress for River and Harbor improvements of a national character, required for the accommodation and security of an existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution and justified by the obligation of Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

16. That a Railroad to the Pacific Ocean is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country; that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction; and that, as preliminary thereto, a daily Overland Mail should be promptly established.

17. Finally, having thus set forth our distinctive principles and views, we invite the co-operation of all citizens, however differing on other questions, who substantially agree with us in their affirmance and support.

SUPPLEMENTARY RESOLUTION.

Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with those men who have been driven, some from their native States and others from the States of their adoption, and are now exiled from their homes on account of their opinions; and we hold the Democratic party responsible for this gross violation of that clause of the Constitution which declares that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

ADOPTED AT CHICAGO, MAY 17, 1860.

LETTERS OF ACCEPTANCE

FROM ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND HANNIBAL HAMLIN,

INDORSING THE PLATFORM.

MR. LINCOLN'S LETTER.

SPRINGFIELD, Ill., May 23, 1860.

Hon. George Ashmun, President of the Republican National Convention:

SIR: I accept the nomination tendered me by the Convention over which you presided, and of which I am formally apprised in the letter of yourself and others, acting as a Committee of the Convention, for that purpose.

The declaration of principles and sentiments, which accompanies your letter, meets my approval; and it shall be my care not to violate, or disregard it, in any part.

Imploring the assistance of Divine Providence; and with due regard to the views and feelings of all who were represented in the Convention; to the rights of all the States, and Territories, and people of the nation; to the inviolability of the Constitution, and the perpetual union, harmony and prosperity of all, I am most happy to co-operate for the practical success of the principles declared by the Convention.

Your obliged friend and fellow-citizen, ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

MR. HAMLIN'S LETTER.

WASHINGTON, May 30, 1860.

GENTLEMEN: Your official communication of the 18th instant, informing me that the representatives of the Republican Party of the United States, assembled at Chicago on that day, had, by a unanimous vote, selected me as their candidate for the office of Vice-President, has been received, together with the resolutions adopted by the Convention as its declaration of principles.

Those resolutions enunciate clearly and forcibly the principles which unite us and the objects proposed to be accomplished. They address themselves to all, and there is neither necessity nor propriety in my entering upon a discussion of any of them. They have the approval of my judgment, and in any action of mine will be faithfully and cordially sustained.

I am profoundly grateful to those with whom it is my pride and pleasure politically to co-operate, for the nomination so unexpectedly conferred; and I desire to tender through you, to the members of the Convention, my sincere thanks for the confidence thus reposed in me. Should the nomination, which I now accept, be ratified by the people, and the duties devolve upon me of presiding over the Senate of the United States, it will be my earnest endeavor faithfully to discharge them with a just regard for the rights of all.

It is to be observed, in connection with the doings of the Republican Convention, that a paramount object with us, is, to preserve the normal condition of our territorial domain as homes for free men. The able advocate and defender of Republican principles whom you have nominated for the highest place that can gratify the ambition of man, comes from a State which has been made what it is, by special action in that respect, of the wise and good men who founded our institutions. The rights of free labor have there been vindicated and maintained. The thrift and enterprise which so distinguished Illinois, one of the most flourishing States of the glorious West, we would see secured to all the Territories of the Union, and restore peace and harmony to the whole country by bringing back the Government to what it was under the wise and patriotic men who created it. If the Republicans shall succeed in that object, as they hope to, they will be held in grateful remembrance by the busy and teeming millions of future ages. I am, very truly, yours, H. HAMLIN.

Hon. GEORGE ASHMUN, President of the Convention, and others of the Committee.

MR. SEWARD'S INDORSEMENT OF THE CANDIDATES AND PLATFORM.

The following cordial indorsement of the Candidates and Platform of the Republican Party appeared in the Auburn Daily Advertiser on the day after the nomination, written by Senator Seward:

"We place the names of Lincoln and Hamlin at the head of our columns, with pride and satisfaction. No truer exposition of the Republican creed could be given, than the platform adopted by the Convention contains. No truer or firmer defenders of the Republican faith could have been found in the Union, than the distinguished and esteemed citizens on whom the honors of the nomination have fallen. Their election, we trust, by a decisive majority, will restore the Government of the United States to its constitutional and ancient course. Let the watchword of the Republican Party, then, be Union and Liberty, and onward to Victory."

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS, NO. 11.

Slavery at War with the Moral Sentiment of the World.

A SPEECH

BY

CARL SCHURZ,

OF WISCONSIN.

Delivered in St. Louis, Aug. 1, 1860.

Mr. President and Gentlemen: To deny the existence of an evil they do not mean to remedy, to ascribe to paltry causes the origin of great problems they do not mean to solve, to charge those who define the nature of an existing difficulty with having originated it—these are expedients which the opponents of reformatory movements have resorted to since mankind has a history. An appeal to ignorance or timidity is their last hope, when all resources of logic and argument are exhausted. The old comedy is repeated again and again.

The assertions that the great contest between Free and Slave Labor has no foundation in fact, that the origin of the Slavery controversy is to be found in the fanaticism of a few Northern Abolitionists, and that those who speak of an "irrepressible conflict" are to be made responsible for its existence—these form the argumentative staple of those who possess either not sagacity enough to discern, or not courage enough to state facts as they are.

In investigating the causes of the great struggle which has for years kept the minds of the people in constant uneasiness and excitement, I shall endeavor to act with the most perfect fairness. I shall not indulge in any denunciations. I shall impeach the motives of no one. I shall not appeal to prejudice or passion. I invite you to pass in review the actual state of things with calmness and impartiality.

It is one of the best traits of human nature, that we form our first opinions on matters of general interest from our innate sense of right and wrong. Our moral impressions, the dictates of our consciences, the generous impulses of our hearts, are the sources from which our first convictions spring. But custom, material interest, and our natural inclinations to acquiesce in that which *is*, whether right or wrong, that *vis inertiæ* which has brought so much suffering upon humanity, are apt to overrule the native instincts of our moral nature. They are sicklied over by the pale cast of calculation; the freshness of their impelling powers is lost, and questions essentially moral are imperceptibly changed into questions of material interest, national economy, or political power.

The people of the South have evidently gone through that process in regard to the institution of Slavery; they have become accustomed to identify its existence with the existence of southern society, while even a large majority of the people of the North were rather inclined to silence their moral objections to it, and to acquiesce, until its immediate interference with matters of general interest gave a new impulse to their native antipathy. Although I am not ashamed to confess, that the moral merits of the question would alone have been more than sufficient to make me an Anti-Slavery man, yet I will confine myself to a discussion of its practical effects, in order to make myself intelligible even to those who do not sympathize with me. This is the first time that I have had the honor to address a meeting in a slave state, and even now I owe the privilege of expressing my opinions freely and without restraint to the circumstance that, although in a slave state, I stand upon the soil of a free city, and under the generous protection of free men. [Applause.] Must I call "a *privilege*" what ought to be universally respected as the sacred birthright of every American citizen? Ask any slaveholder who may be pre-

☞For Sale at the Office of the Albany Evening Journal. Price, per Single Copy, 2c.; per Dozen Copies, 20c.; per Hundred, $1; per Thousand, $8.

sent in this vast assembly whether he does not deem it wrong and unjustifiable that I, an Anti-Slavery man, should be permitted to give a public expression of my views in a slave state? whether he would not be in favor of silencing me by whatever means within his reach? whether I would not be silenced at once in a strong slaveholding community? I do not mean to blame him for it. Let us give him a fair hearing. The slaveholder will state his political views substantially as follows:

"On a point of astronomy, or chemistry, or medicine, you may entertain and express whatever opinion you please; but we cannot permit you to discuss the relation between master and servant, as it exists here in the slave states, for in doing so you would endanger our safety and undermine our social system. Our condition is such that the slightest movement of insubordination once started, is apt to grow with uncontrollable rapidity; we have, therefore, to guard against everything that may start it; we cannot allow free discussion of the subject; we have to remove from our midst every incendiary element; we cannot be expected to tolerate opinions or persons among us that are opposed to the ruling order of things. Whenever a mischievous attempt is made, we are obliged to repress it with such energy and severity as to strike terror into the hearts of those who might be capable of repeating the attempt. Our condition requires the promptest action, and if, in cases of imminent danger, the regular process of the courts is too slow or uncertain, we are obliged to resort to lynch law in order to supply its deficiencies.

"Moreover, we must adopt our rules and customs of government to the peculiar wants of our social organization. In order to be safe, we must intrust the government in its general administration, as well as its details, to those who, by their own interests, are bound to be the natural guardians of the system. Hence our safety requires that the political power in our states should be put into the hands of slaveholders; and where we have no law to that effect, custom upholds the rule.

"In order to put the political ascendancy of those who are most interested in the preservation of Slavery upon a solid basis, we must put down anything that would produce and foster independent aspirations among the other classes of society. It would not only be insane to educate the slaves, but highly dangerous to extend to the great mass of poor white non-slaveholders the means of education; for in doing so we might raise an element to influence and power, whose interests are not identical with those of the slaveholder. This is our policy of self-preservation, and we are bound to enforce it."

Sir, I mean to be just to the slaveholders; and, strange as it may sound, as to the propriety of their policy I agree with them. Having identified their social existence with the existence of Slavery, they cannot act otherwise.

It is necessity that urges them on. It is true that Slavery is an inflammable element. A stray spark of thought or hope may cause a terrible conflagration. The torch of free speech and press, which gives light to the house of Liberty, is very apt to set on fire the house of Slavery. What is more natural than that the torch should be extinguished where there is such an abundance of explosive material?

It is true that in a slaveholding community the strictest subordination must be enforced, that the maintenance of established order requires the most rigorous preventive and repressive measures, which will not always allow of a strict observance of the rules of legal process; it is equally true that the making and the execution of the laws can be safely intrusted only to those who, by their position, are bound to the ruling interest; true, that popular education is dangerous to the exclusive rule of an exclusive class; true, that men must be kept stupid in order to be kept obedient. What is more consistent, therefore, than that fundamental liberties should be disregarded whenever they become dangerous; that the safeguards of human rights in the administration of justice, should be set aside whenever the emergency calls for prompt and energetic action; that the masses should be left uneducated, in order to give the slaveholding Oligarchy an undisputed sway? In one word, that the rights, the liberties and the security of the individual should have to yield to the paramount consideration of the safety of the ruling interest? All this is true; and accepting the premises, all these necessities exist. You seem startled at this proposition, and ask, What is the institution that demands for its protection such measures? The Slave States are by no means original in this respect. Look at the kingdom of Naples, where the ruling power is governed by similar exclusive interests, and acts on the same instinct of self-preservation; does it not resort to the same means? You tell me that the principles underlying our system of government are very different from those of the kingdom of Naples, and that the means of protection I spoke of run contrary to the spirit of our institutions. Indeed, so it seems to be. What does that prove? Simply this: That a social institution which is in antagonism with the principles of democratic government, cannot be maintained and protected by means which are in accordance with those principles; and on the other hand, that a social institution which cannot be protected by means which are in accordance with the democratic principles of our government, must essentially be in antagonism to those principles. It proves that the people in the slaveholding States, although pretending to be freemen, are, by the necessities arising from their condition, the slaves of Slavery. That is all.

But I am told that the Slave States are sovereign, and may shape and govern their home concerns according to their own notions, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. Granted. But the necessities of Slavery do not stop there. The Slave States are members of a federal family, and as the King of Naples in his foreign policy is governed by his peculiar interests, so is the policy of the Slave States in our federal affairs governed by their peculiar necessities.

I hear much said of the aggressive spirit of the Slave Power, but I am almost inclined to acquit it of that charge, for all its apparently aggressive attempts are no less dictated by instinct of self-preservation, than the most striking features of its home policy.

Let us listen to the slaveholder again. He

says: "What will become of the security of our slave property, if inside of this Union a slave may finally escape from the hands of his master, by simply crossing the line of his State? But the fanatical Anti-Slavery spirit prevailing in the Free States, will avail itself of every facility the common legal process affords, as the trial by jury and the writ of *habeas corpus*, to aid the fugitive in his escape. We are, therefore, obliged to demand such legislation at the hands of our General Government as will remove these obstacles thrown in the way of the recapture of our property, and oblige the citizens, by law, to assist us in the re-apprehension of the fugitive, so the trial by jury and the writ of *habeas corpus* will have to yield, and the good old common law principle, that in all cases concerning life and liberty, the presumption be in favor of liberty, goes by the board." This may seem rather hard, but is it not eminently consistent?

The necessities of Slavery do not stop there. Let us hear how the slaveholder proceeds: "In order to obtain such legislation from our national councils, it is necessary that the prejudices against Slavery existing in the Free States be disarmed. It is impossible that the slave interest should deem itself secure as long as a violent agitation is kept up against it, which continually troubles us at home, and exercises upon the National Legislature an influence hostile to Slavery. We are, therefore, obliged to demand that measures be taken to stop that agitation." Nothing more natural than that. The right of petition, held sacred even by some despotic governments, must be curtailed. Post-Office regulations have to prevent the dissemination of Anti Slavery sentiments by the newspapers. Even in the Free States willing instruments are found, who urge the adoption of measures tending to suppress the very discussion of this question. Laws are advocated in Congress (and that "champion of free labor," Douglas, takes the lead), making it a criminal offense to organize associations hostile to Slavery, and empowering the General Government to suppress them by means of a centralized police. [Loud cheers.] This may seem somewhat tyrannical, but is it not eminently consistent? [Applause.]

But in order to succeed in this, Slavery needs a controlling power in the General Government. It cannot expect to persuade us, so it must try to subdue and rule us. Hear the slaveholder: "It is impossible that we should consider our interests safe in this Union, unless the political equilibrium between the Free and Slave States be restored. If the Free States are permitted to increase and the Slave States stand still, we shall be completely at the mercy of a hostile majority. We are therefore obliged to demand accessions of territory out of which new Slave States can be formed, so as to increase our representation in Congress, and to restore the equilibrium of power." Nothing more sensible. The acquisition of foreign countries, such as Cuba and the Northern States of Mexico, is demanded, and, if they cannot be obtained by fair purchase and diplomatic transaction, war must be resorted to; and, if the majority of the people are not inclined to go to war, our international relations must be disturbed by fillibustering expeditions, precipitating, if possible, this country into wars, thus forcing the peaceable or cheating the enthusiastic into subserviency to the plans of the Slave Power. You may call this piracy, disgracing us in the eyes of the civilized world. But can you deny that Slavery needs power, and that it cannot obtain that power except by extension?

So, pressed by its necessities, it lays its hand upon our national territories. Time-honored compacts, hemming in Slavery, must be abrogated. The Constitution must be so construed as to give Slavery unlimited sway over our national domain. Hence your Nebraska bills and Dred Scott decisions, and Slave Code platforms. You may call that atrocious, but can you deny its consistency?

"But," adds the slaveholder, "of what use is to us the abstract right to go with our slave property into the Territories, if you pass laws which attract to the Territories a class of population that will crowd out Slavery; if you attract to them the foreign immigrant by granting him the immediate enjoyment of political rights; if you allure the pauper from all parts of the globe by your preëmption laws and homestead bills? We want the negro in the Territories. You give us the foreign immigrant. Slavery cannot exist except with the system of large farms, and your homestead bills establish the system of small farms, with which free labor is inseparably connected. We are, therefore, obliged to demand that all such mischievous projects be abandoned." Nothing more plausible. Hence the right of the laboring man to acquire property in the soil by his labor is denied; your homestead bills voted down, and the blight of oppressive speculation fastened upon your virgin soil, and attempts are made to deprive the foreign immigrant in the Territories of the immediate enjoyment of political rights, which, in the primitive state of social organization, are essential to his existence. All this in order to give Slavery a chance to obtain possession of our national domain. This may seem rather hard. But can you deny that Slavery for its own protection needs power in the general government? That it cannot obtain that power except by increased representation? That it cannot increase its representation except by conquest and extension over the Territories? and that with this policy all measures are incompatible which bid fair to play the Territories into the hands of free labor?

This is not all. Listen to the slaveholder once more: "Our states," he tells us, "are essentially agricultural producing states. We have but little commerce, and still less manufacturing industry. All legislation tending to benefit the commercial and manufacturing interests principally, is therefore to our immediate prejudice. It will oblige us to contribute to the growth and prosperity of the free states at our expense, and consequently turn the balance of political power still more against us. We are, therefore, obliged to demand that all attempts to promote, by federal legislation, the industrial interest, be given up." Nothing more logical. The system of slave labor has never permitted them to recognize and develop the harmony of agricultural and industrial and commercial pursuits. What is more natural, than that they should seek to give the peculiar economical interest in which their superiority consists, the preponderance in our economical policy? Hence their unrelenting opposition to all legislation tending to develop the peculiar resources of the free states.

Here let us pause. Is there anything strange or surprising in all this? You may call it madness, but there is method in this madness. The slave power is impelled by the irrepressible power of necessity. It cannot exist unless it rules, and it cannot rule unless it keeps down its opponents. All its demands and arts are in strict harmony with its interests and attributes; they are the natural growth of its existence. I repeat, I am willing to acquit it of the charge of willful aggression; I am willing to concede that it struggles for self-preservation; but now the momentous question arises, how do the means which seem to be indispensable for the self-preservation of Slavery agree with the existence and interests of free-labor society?

Sir, if Mr. Hammond of South Carolina, or Mr. Brown of Mississippi, had listened to me, would they not be obliged to give me credit for having stated their case fairly? Now listen to me, while I state our own.

Cast your eyes over that great bee-hive, called the free states. See by the railroad and the telegraphic wire every village, almost every backwood cottage, drawn within the immediate reach of progressive civilization. Look over our grain fields, but lately a lonesome wilderness, where machinery is almost superseding the labor of the human hand; over our workshops, whose aspect is almost daily changed by the magic touch of inventive genius; over our fleets of merchant vessels, numerous enough to make the whole world tributary to our prosperity; look upon our society, where by popular education and the continual change of condition, the dividing lines between ranks and classes are almost obliterated; look upon our system of public instruction, which places even the lowliest child of the people upon the high road of progressive advancement; upon our rapid growth and expansive prosperity, which is indeed subject to reverses and checks, but contains such a wonderful fertility of resources, that every check is a mere incentive for new enterprise, every reverse but a mere opportunity for the development of new powers.

To what do we owe all this? First and foremost to that perfect freedom of inquiry which acknowledges no rules but those of logic, no limits but those that bound the faculties of the human mind. [Cheers.] Its magic consists in its universality. To it we owe the harmony of our progressive movement in all its endless ramifications. No single science, no single practical pursuit exists in our day independently of all other sciences, all other practical pursuits. This is the age of the solidarity of progress. Set a limit to the freedom of inquiry in one direction and you destroy the harmony of its propelling action. Give us the Roman inquisition, which forbids Galileo Galites to think that the earth moves round the sun, and he has to interrupt and give up the splendid train of his discoveries, and their influence upon all other branches of science is lost; he has to give it up, or he must fight the inquisition. [Cheers.] Let the slave power or any other political or economical interest tell us that we must think, and say, and invent, and discover nothing which is against its demands—and we must interrupt and give up the harmony of our progressive development, or fight the tyrannical pretension, whatever shade it may assume. [Loud cheers.]

Believing, as we do, that the moral and ideal development of man is the true aim and end of human society, we must preserve in their efficiency the means which serve that end. In order to secure to the freedom of inquiry its full productive power, we must surround it with all the safeguards which political institutions afford. As we cannot set a limit to the activity of our minds, so we cannot muzzle our mouths or fetter the press with a censorship. [Applause.] *We cannot arrest or restrain the discussion of the question, what system of labor, or what organization of society promotes best the moral and intellectual development of man.* [Loud applause.] We cannot deprive a single individual of the privileges which protect him in the free exercise of his faculties, and the enjoyment of his right, so long as these faculties are not employed to the detriment of the rights and liberties of others. Our organization of society resting upon equal rights, we find our security in a general system of popular education which fits all for an intelligent exercise of those rights. This is the home policy of free labor society. This policy in our federal affairs must necessarily correspond. Deeming free and intelligent labor the only safe basis of society, it is our duty to expand its blessings over all the territory within our reach; seeing our own prosperity advanced by the prosperity of our neighbors, we must endeavor to plant upon our borders a system of labor which answers in that respect. Do we recognize the right of the laboring man to the soil he cultivates and shield him against oppressive speculation? Seeing in the harmonious development of all branches of labor a source of progress and power, we must adopt a policy which draws to light the resources of the land, gives work to our workshops and security to our commerce. These are the principles and views governing our policy.

Slaveholders, look at this picture, and at this. Can the difference escape your observation? You may say, as many have said, that there is indeed a difference of principles, but not necessarily an antagonism of interests. Look again.

Your social system is founded upon forced labor, ours upon free labor. Slave labor cannot exist together with freedom of inquiry, and so you demand the restriction of that freedom; free labor cannot exist without it, and so we maintain its inviolability. Slave labor demands the setting aside of the safeguards of individual liberty, for the purpose of upholding subordination and protecting slave property; free labor demands their preservation as essential and indispensable to its existence and progressive development. Slavery demands extension by an aggressive foreign policy; free labor demands an honorable peace and friendly intercourse with the world abroad for its commerce, and a peaceable and undisturbed development of our resources at home for its agriculture and industry. Slavery demands extension over national territories for the purpose of gaining political power; free labor demands the national domain for working men for the purpose of spreading the blessings of liberty and civilization. Slavery therefore opposes all measures tending to secure the soil to the actual laborer; free labor therefore recognizes the right of the settler to the soil, and demands measures protecting him against the pressure of speculation. Slavery de-

mands the absolute ascendency of the planting interest in our economical policy; free labor demands legislation tending to develop all the resources of the land, and to harmonize the agricultural, commercial and industrial interests. Slavery demands the control of the General Government for its special protection and the promotion of its peculiar interests; free labor demands that the General Government be administered for the purpose of securing to all the blessings of liberty, and for the promotion of the general welfare. [Tremendous applause] Slavery demands the recognition of its divine right; free labor recognizes no divine right but that of the liberty of all men. [Loud cheers.]

With one word, *Slavery demands for its protection and perpetuation a system of polivy which is utterly incompatible with the principles upon which the organization of Free Labor society rests.* There is the antagonism. That is the essence of the "irrepressible conflict." It is a conflict of principles underlying interests, always the same, whether appearing as a moral, economical, or political question. Mr. Douglas boasted that he could repress it with police measures; he might as well try to fetter the winds with a rope. The South mean to repress it with decisions of the Supreme Court; they might as well, like Xerxes, try to subdue the waves of the ocean by throwing chains into the water. [Applause.]

The conflict of constitutional constructions is indeed but a mere incident of the great struggle —*a mere symptom of the crisis.* Long before the Slavery question in the form of an abstract constitutional controversy agitated the public mind, the conflict of interests raged in our national councils. What mattered it that the struggle about the encouragement of home industry and internal improvements was not ostensibly carried on under the firm of pro and anti slavery? What mattered it that your new-fangled constitutional doctrines were not yet invented, when Slavery tried to expand by the annexation of foreign countries? that no Dred Scott decision was yet cooked up, when the right of petition was curtailed, when attempts were made to arrest the discussion of the Slavery question all over the Union, and when the trial by jury and the writ of habeas corpus was overridden by the Fugitive Slave Law? And even lately, when the Slave Power with one gigantic grasp attempted to seize the whole of our national domain, what else was and is your new constitutional doctrine but an ill-disguised attempt to clothe a long-cherished design with the color of law?

Read your history with an impartial eye, and you will find that the construction of the Constitution always shaped itself according to the prevailing moral impulses or the predominance of material over political interests. The logic of our minds is but too apt to follow in the track of our sympathies and aspirations. It was when the South had control of our government, that acts were passed for the raising of duties on imports, for the creation of a national bank, and in aid of the American shipping interest. It was under the lead of the South, that the systems of internal improvement and of the protection of home industry were inaugurated; it was the South no less than the North, that insisted upon and exercised the power of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories. So long as these measures seemed to agree with the predominant interest, there seemed to be no question about their constitutionality. Even Mr. Calhoun himself said in one of his most celebrated speeches, delivered in the session of 1815–16, "That it was the duty of the Government, as a means of defense, to encourage the domestic industry of the country." But as soon as it was found out that this policy redounded more to the benefit of free labor, than that of the unenterprising South, then the same men who had inaugurated it, worked its overthrow on the plea that it was at war with the principles of the Constitution. [Murmurs of applause.] The constitutionality of the Ordinance of 1787, was never questioned as long as the prevailing sentiment of the South ran against the perpetuation of Slavery. The Missouri Compromise was held as sacred and inviolable as the Constitution itself, so long as it served to introduce Slave States into this Union; but no sooner were, by virtue of its provisions, Free Territories to be organized, than its unconstitutionality was at once discovered.

The predominance of interests determines the construction of the Constitution. So it was and so it ever will be. Only those who remained true to the original programme of the fathers, remained true to the original construction. Decide the contest of principles underlying interests, and the conflict of constitutional constructions will *settle itself.* This way seems a dangerous political theory. It is not an article of my creed —not a matter of principle—but a matter of experience; not a doctrine, but a fact.

Thus the all-pervading antagonism stands before us, gigantic in its dimensions, growing every day in the awful proportions of its problems, involving the character of our institutions; involving our relations with the world abroad; involving our peace, our rights and liberties at home; involving our growth and prosperity; involving our moral and political existence as a nation.

How short-sighted, how childish are those who find its origin in artificial agitation? As though we could produce a tempest by blowing our noses, or an earthquake by stamping our puny feet upon the ground. [Laughter.] But how to solve, how to decide it? Let us pass in review our political parties, and the remedies they propose. There we encounter the so-called Union party, with Bell and Everett who tell us the best way to settle the conflict is to ignore it. [Laughter.]

Ignore it! Ignore it, when attempts are made to plunge the country into war and disgrace for the purpose of Slavery extension! Ignore it, when Slavery and free labor wage their fierce war about the possession of the national domain! Ignore it, when the liberties of speech and press are attacked! Ignore it, when the actual settler claims the virgin soil, and the slaveholding capitalists claim it also! Ignore it, when the planting interest seeks to establish and maintain its exclusive supremacy in our economical policy! Ignore it, indeed! Ignore the fire that consumes the corner-posts of your house! Ignore the storm that breaks the rudder and tears to tatters the sails of your ship! Conjure the revolted elements with a meek Mount Vernon lecture!

Pour upon the furious waves the placid oil of a quotation from Washington's farewell address! [Cheers and laughter.]

It is true they tell us they will enforce the laws and the Constitution well enough! But what laws? Those that free labor demand, or those that Slavery gives us? What Constitution? That of Washington and Madison, or that of Slidell, Douglas and Taney? [Loud and long continued cheering.]

The conflict stands there with the stubborn, brutal force of reality. However severely it may disturb the nerves of timid gentlemen, there it stands and speaks the hard, stern language of fact. I understand well that great problems and responsibilities should be approached with care and caution. But times like these demand the firm actions of men who know what they will, *and will it*, not that eunuch policy, which, conscious of its own unproductiveness, invites us blandly to settle down into the imbecile contentment of general impotency. They *cannot* ignore the conflict if they would, but have not nerve enough to decide it if they could.

The next party that claims our attention is the so-called Democracy. As it is my object to discuss the practical, not the constitutional merits of the problem before us, I might pass over the divisions existing in that organization. In fact, the point which separates Mr. Douglas from Mr. Breckinridge is but a mere quibble, a mere matter of etiquette. Mr. Douglas is unwilling to admit in words what he has a hundred times admitted in fact, for, can you tell me, what practical difference in the world there is between direct and indirect intervention by Congress in favor of Slavery, and that kind of non-intervention by Congress which merely consists in making room for direct intervention by the Supreme Court? And besides, in nearly all practical measures of policy Mr. Douglas is regularly to be found on the side of the extreme South. Like that great statesman of yours (I beg your pardon, gentlemen, for alluding to him in decent political company), he always votes against measures for the encouragement of home industry, perhaps because he does not understand them. [Laughter.] He is one of the firmest supporters of the ascendency of the planters' interest in our economical questions; and as to the extension of Slavery by conquest and annexation, the wildest fillibusters may always count upon his tenderest sympathies.

So I say I might have ignored him, if he had not succeeded in creating the most deafening of noises with the hollowest of drums. [Loud cheers.]

He proposes to "repress the irrepressible conflict" with what he emphatically styles "his great principle." At first he defined it as "self-government of the people in the territories;" but it became soon apparent that under his great principle the people of the territories were governed by anybody but self, and he called it "popular sovereignty." It soon turned out that this kind of sovereignty was not very popular, after all, and he called it "non-intervention." [Laughter.] Methinks something will intervene, pretty soon, and he will strain his imagination for another name, if it be worth while at all to christen a thing which never had any tangible existence.

But if we may believe him, his "great principle," and nothing but his "great principle," will settle the irrepressible conflict, restore peace and harmony to the nation, and save the Union—and, in fact, Mr. Douglas is about the only one among the Presidential candidates who insists that there is an immediate necessity of saving that ancient institution.

Let us judge the merits of his great principle by its results: Has it secured to the inhabitants of the territories the right of self-government? Never were the people of a territory subject to a despotism more arbitrary, and to a violence more lawless and atrocious, than were the people of Kansas, after the enactment of the Nebraska bill. Has it removed the slavery question from the halls of Congress? The fight has never raged with greater fierceness, and Congress came hardly ever so near debating with bowie knives and revolvers, as about the questions raised by the Nebraska bill. Has it established safe and uniform rules for the construction of the constitution? It has set aside the construction put upon the constitution by those who framed it; and for the rest, let Mr. Douglas give you his opinion on the Dred Scott decision. Has it given peace and harmony to the country by repressing the irrepressible conflict? Alas! poor great principle! this harangue of peace and harmony inflamed the irrepressible conflict, even inside of the Democratic party, and rent into two sections an organization which claimed the exclusive privilege of nationality.

These were its immediate results. It is true, Mr. Douglas accuses his adversaries of having created the disturbance. Certainly; if the whole American nation had bowed their heads in silent obedience before Mr. Douglas' mandates, there would have been no strife. Mr. Slidell, Mr. Buchanan, and Mr. Breckinridge, may say the same; so may the emperor of Austria and the king of Naples. Such men are apt to be disturbed by opponents, and Mr. Douglas need not be surprised if he has a few! The true source of the difficulty was this: The Kansas-Nebraska bill was thrown as an ambiguous, illogical measure, between two antagonistic interests, each of which construed it for its own advantage. It brought the contesting forces together, face to face, without offering a clear ground upon which to settle the conflict. Thus it quickened and intensified the struggle, instead of allaying it. Hence its total failure as a harmonizing measure.

What, then, is its positive result? As to its practical importance in the conflict between Free and Slave Labor, Mr. Douglas himself enlightens us, as follows:

"Has the South been excluded from all the territory acquired from Mexico? What says the bill from the House of Representatives now on your table, repealing the slave code in New Mexico established by the people themselves? It is part of the history of the country that under this doctrine of non-intervention, this doctrine that you delight to call Squatter Sovereignty, the people of New Mexico have introduced and protected Slavery in the whole of that Territory. Under this doctrine, they have converted a tract of Free territory into Slave territory, more than five times the size of the State of New York. Under this doctrine, Slavery has been extended from the Rio Grande to the Gulf of California, and from the line of the Republic of Mexico, not only up to 36° 30′, but up to 38°—giving you a degree and a half more Slave Territory than you ever claimed. In 1848 and 1849 and 1850, you only asked to have the line of 36° 30′. The Nashville Convention fixed that as its ultimatum. I offered it in the Senate in August, 1848, and it was adopted here but rejected

in the House of Representatives. You asked only up to 36° 30′, and non-intervention has given you Slave Territory up to 38°, a degree and a half more than you asked, and yet you say this is a sacrifice of Southern rights.

"These are the fruits of this principle which the Senator from Mississippi regards as hostile to the rights of the South. Where did you ever get any other fruits that were more palatable to your taste, or more refreshing to your strength? What other inch of Free Territory has been converted into Slave Territory on the American Continent, since the Revolution, except in New Mexico and Arizona, under the principle of non-intervention affirmed at Charleston? If it is true that this principle of non-intervention has conferred upon you all that immense territory; has protected Slavery in that comparatively northern and cold region where you did not expect it to go, cannot you trust the same principle further South, when you come to acquire additional territory from Mexico. If it be true that this principle of non-intervention has given to Slavery all New Mexico, which was surrounded on nearly every side by Free Territory, will not the same principle protect you in the Northern States of Mexico when they are acquired, since they are now surrounded by Slave Territory!"

Indeed? This, then, is the practical solution of the difficulty which Mr. Douglas proposes. The "great principle of non-intervention," which, according to his own testimony, strengthens Slavery, by increasing the number of Slave States, and their representation and power in our General Government; to which is to be added the annexation of Cuba and the Northern States of Mexico, out of which an additional number of Slave States is to be carved. But his Northern friends say that he is the champion of Free labor—and they are honorable men.

Oh, what a deep-seated, overweening confidence Mr. Douglas, when he made this statement, must have had in the unfathomable, desperate, incorrigible stupidity of those Northern Democrats who support him for the purpose of baffling and punishing the fire-eaters of the South. Good innocent souls, do they not see that by supporting Mr. Douglas's policy, which throws into the lap of Slavery, Territory after Territory, they will strengthen and render more overbearing the very same Slave Power they mean to baffle and punish? Do they not see that they are preparing a lash for their own backs? It is true, when they feel it, and *they* deserve to feel it, they may console themselves with the idea that it is a whip of their own manufacture!

At last we arrive at the programme of the Slave Power in its open and undisguised forms, of which Mr. Breckinridge is the representative and Mr. Douglas the servant, although he does not wear its livery, except on occasions of state.

This programme is as follows: The agitation of the Slavery question North and South is to be arrested; the Fugitive Slave law, in its present form, is to be strictly carried out, and all State legislation impeding its execution to be repealed; the Constitutional right of Slavery to occupy the Territories of the United States, and to be protected there is to be acknowledged; all measures tending to impede the ingress of Slavery, and its establishment in the Territories, are to be abandoned; the opposition to the conquest and annexation of foreign countries out of which more slave states can be formed, is to be given up; the economical policy of the planting interest to the exclusion of the encouragement of home industry, is to become the ruling policy of the country.

This is the Southern solution of the irrepressible conflict.

This programme possesses at least the merit of logic. The logic of Slavery and Despotism against the logic of Free Labor and Liberty. The issue is plainly made up. Free labor is summoned to submit to the measures which Slavery deems necessary for its perpetuation. We are called upon to adapt our laws and systems of policy, and the whole development of our social organization, to the necessities and interests of slavery. *We are summoned to surrender.* Let us for a moment judge the people of the free states by the meanest criterion we can think of; let us apply suppositions to them, which, if applied to ourselves, we would consider an insult.

If the people of the free states were so devoid of moral sense as not to distinguish between right and wrong; so devoid of generous impulses as not to sympathize with the downtrodden and degraded; so devoid of manly pride as to be naturally inclined to submit to everybody who was impudent enough to assume the command—tell me, even in this worst, this most disgusting of all contingencies, could free labor quietly submit to the demands of the Slave Power so long as it has a just appreciation of its own interests? If we did not care, either for other people's rights nor for our own dignity, can we submit as long as we care for our own pockets? Surrender the privilege of discussing our social problems without restraint! Be narrowed down to a given circle of ideas, which we shall not transgress! Do we not owe our growth, and prosperity, and power, to that freedom of inquiry which is the source of all progress and improvement?

Surrender the national territories to Slavery! Do we not owe our growth and prosperity to the successful labor of our neighbors just as well as our own? Shall we consent to be surrounded and hemmed in with thriftless communities, whose institutions retard their growth, and thereby retard our own? Abandon all laws like the Homestead bill, tending to establish free labor on our national domain! Shall we thus give up the rights of labor, and destroy the inheritance of our children?

Give up our opposition to the extension of Slavery by the conquest of foreign countries! Shall we squander the blood of our sons and the marrow of the land in destructive wars, for the profit of the enemies of free labor, while it is a peaceful development to which we owe our power in the world? Adopt the exclusive economical policy of the planting interest! Shall our mineral wealth sleep undeveloped in the soil? Shall our water-powers run idle, and the bustle of our factories cease? Shall the immense laboring force in our increasing population be deprived of the advantage of a harmonious development of all the branches of human labor? Shall we give up our industrial and commercial independence from the world abroad? Impossible! It cannot be thought of! Even the most debased and submissive of our doughfaces cannot submit to it as soon as the matter comes to a practical test; and therefore the success of the Southern programme will never bring about a final decision of the conflict. Suppose we were beaten in the present electoral contest, would that decide the conflict of interests forever? No! Thanks to the nobler impulses of human nature, our consciences would

not let us sleep; thanks to the good sense of the people, their progressive interests would not suffer them to give up the struggle. The power of resistance, the elasticity of free society, cannot be exhausted by one, cannot be annihilated by a hundred defeats. Why? Because it receives new impulses, new inspiratious from every day's work; it marches on in harmony with the spirit of the age.

There is but one way of settling the "irrepressible conflict." It is not by resisting the spirit of the times, and by trying to neutralize its impelling power; for you attempt that in vain: *but it is by neutralizing the obstacles which have thrown themselves into its path.* There is no other. The irrepressible conflict will rage with unabated fury until our social and political development is harmonized with the irrepressible tendency of the age.

That is the solution which the Republicans propose. Their programme is simple and consistent:

Protection of our natural and constitutional rights.

Non-interference with the social and political institutions existing by the legislation of sovereign States. Exclusion of Slavery from the national Territories; they must be free because they are national. [Immense cheering.]

Promotion and expansion of free labor by the Homestead bill, and the encouragement of home industry. [Cheering renewed.]

Will this effect a settlement of the conflict. Let the fathers of this Republic answer the question, and I will give you the Southern construction of their policy. In a debate which occurred in the Senate of the United States, on the 23d of January, Mr. Mason of Virginia said: "Now, as far as concerns our ancestry, I am satisfied of this—they were not Abolitionists. On the contrary, I believe this was their opinion: their prejudice was aimed against the foreign slave-trade, the African slave-trade, and their belief was, that cutting that off, *Slavery would die out of itself, without any act of abolition.* I attempted at one time to show, by the recorded opinions of Mr. Madison, that the famous Ordinance of 1787, so far as it prohibited Slavery in the territory north-west of the Ohio, was aimed at the African slave-trade, and at that alone; the idea being, *that if they would restrict the area into which slaves would be introduced* from abroad, they would, to that extent, prevent the importation of slaves; and that, when it was altogether prevented, the *condition of Slavery would die out of itself;* but they were not Abolitionists, far less within the meaning and spirit of the Abolitionists of the present day."

Well, I am willing to accept this, as it stands, and Mr. Mason may certainly be considered good Southern authority. I will not stop to investigate the depth and extent of the Anti-Slavery sentiments of such men as Franklin, who was the father of an Abolition society, and of Washington, who expressed his desire "to see Slavery abolished by law;" I am satisfied with Mr. Mason's admission.

This, then, is what the fathers intended to effect, *to bring about a state of things by which Slavery would die out of itself.* What else do we want? "You mean, then," I am asked, "to adopt a policy which will work the peaceful and gradual extinction of Slavery?" And I answer, "Yes; for if we do not, we shall have to submit to a policy which will work the gradual extinction of liberty." There is the dilemma. Our answer is understood. If Washington, Madison and Jefferson were Abolitionists, we are. Mr. Mason says they were not; well, then, we are not, for our policy has been theirs, and theirs has become ours. [Loud cheers.]

Will this policy effect a solution of the conflict? It will; because it will harmonize our social and political development with the tendency of our age, by neutralizing the obstacles that stand in its way.

But I am told that these obstacles refuse to be neutralized. They will resist. Resist by what? By dissolving the Union. The dissolution of the Union! This spectre has so long haunted the imaginations of superstitious people, that it is time, at last, to anatomize the bloodless body.

They threaten to dissolve the Union. Why? First, because we do not stop the agitation of the Slavery question. It is true, we do discuss every social problem that presents itself to our consideration; we agitate it, and we do not mean to stop. And, therefore, slaveholders, you will dissolve the Union? Do you think we shall make haste to stop the agitation—to muzzle our mouths and our press—after you have dissolved it? United as we are with you at present, we certainly are not devoid of fraternal sympathy; but let the acrimonious feeling arising from a divorce embitter our relations, will not the agitation, which annoys you *now*, be a hundred times more dangerous to you *then?* [Cheers.]

Second. You threaten to dissolve the Union, because we do not show sufficient alacrity in the catching of fugitive slaves. True, we are not much inclined to perform for the slaveholder a menial, dirty service, which he would hardly stoop to do for himself. [Enthusiastic cheering.] And, therefore, you will dissolve the Union! Do you not see that, while now, indeed, a great many slaves escape, the North would, after a dissolution, scorn to surrender a single one? Would not what is now the Canada line be removed right to the banks of the Ohio?

Thirdly. You threaten the dissolution of the Union, because we do not mean to surrender the territories to slavery. True, we mean to use every constitutional means within our reach to save them for free labor. And, therefore, you will dissolve the Union! Do you think that, after a dissolution, we shall courteously invite slavery to make itself comfortable on our national domain? As things are now, "champions of free labor," such as Douglas, may occasionally offer you a chance to acquire for slavery a territory "five times as large as the State of New York," but will that be possible after the Union is dissolved? Mark well what position the North will take if, by a revolutionary act against our National Government, you should attempt to cut loose from the Union. The territories are the property of the Union as such; those who, in a revolutionary way, desert the Union, give up their right to the property of the Union. That property, the territories, will remain where the Union remains, and the slave power would do well first to consider how much blood it can spare, before it attempts to strip the Union of a single square foot of ground. [Tremendous cheers.]

Thus, while, according to Judge Douglas, you now have a chance to acquire slave territory by the operation of his "great principle," that chance will be entirely gone as soon as by a secession you give up the least shadow of a right to the property of the Union.

Lastly, you threaten to dissolve the Union, if the North refuses to submit to the exclusive economical policy of the planting interest. You want to establish the commercial and industrial independence of the Slaveholding States. For years you have held Southern Conventions, and passed resolutions to that effect. You resolved not to purchase any longer the products of Northern industrial labor, but to build your own factories; not to carry on your exporting and importing trade any longer by northern ships, but to establish steamship lines and commercial connections of your own. Well enough. Why did you not do it, after having resolved it? Was it want of money? You have an abundance of it. Was it want of determination? Your resolutions displayed the fiercest zeal. What was it, then? And, indeed, the failure is magnificently complete. Senator Mason's homespun coat, sewn with Yankee thread and needle, adorned with Yankee buttons, hangs in the closet, a lone star in solitary splendor. [Loud laughter.] After trying to establish a large shoe factory for the South, you came after a while to the irresistible conclusion that you must wear Massachusetts shoes and boots or go barefooted. And even your Norfolk steamships are not launched yet from the dry docks of Southern imagination. [Laughter.] How is this? I will tell you. The very same institution for the protection and perpetuation of which you want to establish your commercial and industrial independence is incompatible with commercial and industrial labor and enterprise.

For this there are several excellent reasons. First, that class of your society which rules and wants to perpetuate its rule, does not consist of working men. The inspiration of regular activity is foreign to their minds. Living upon the forced labor of others, they find their pride in being gentlemen of leisure. But it requires men of a superior organization to make leisure productive; men of the ordinary stamp, who have too much leisure for doing something, will in most cases do nothing. But it requires active labor to make us understand and appreciate labor; and we must understand and appreciate labor in order to be able to direct labor. Hence the slaveholders cannot take the lead in such a commercial and industrial movement without changing the nature of their condition. But you may object, that they can at least encourage commercial industry, and leave the execution of their plans and wishes to others. Indeed! But you must not forget, that in modern times the most active and enterprising class of society, as soon as it becomes numerous, will inevitably become the ruling class. How can, therefore, the slaveholders do as you say, without undermining the foundation of their own ascendency? But it is just that ascendency by which they mean not to weaken but to fortify. Do not bring forward this city of St. Louis as proof to the contrary. Your commerce and your industry are indeed largely developed, although Missouri is a Slave State, but do you not see that in the same measure as they rise, the ascendency of the Slave Power disappears? [Repeated cheering.] Thus this has become a free city on slave soil.

But this is not all. Not only are the slaveholders, as a class, unfit to direct the commercial and industrial movement, but their system of labor is unfit to carry it out. Commerce and industry, in order to become independent, need *intelligent* labor. In the North every laborer thinks, and is required to think. In the South the laborer is forbidden to think, lest he think too much, for thought engenders aspirations. [Laughter and applause.] With us, progress and enterprise derive their main support, their strongest impulses, from the intellectual development of the working classes. We do not dread the aspirations arising from it; it is the source of our prosperity and, at the same time, of our safety. Our laboring man must be a free man, in order to be what he ought to be—an intelligent laborer. Therefore we educate him for liberty by our system of public instruction. In the South, the intellectual development of the laboring classes, necessary for intelligent labor, would create aspirations dangerous to your domestic institutions. Your laboring man must be a brute in order to remain what you want him to be—a slave. Therefore you withhold from him all means of intellectual development. Among our farms and workshops there stands an institution from which *our* system of labor derives its inspirations; that is our school-house, where our free laborers are educated. On your plantation fields there stands another institution from which your system of labor derives its inspirations; and that is *your* school-house, where your slaves are flogged. And you speak of establishing the commercial and industrial independence of the Slaveholding States! Do you not see, that in order to do this, you must adapt your system of labor to that purpose, by making the laborer intelligent, respectable, and at the same time aspiring? But if by making the laborer intelligent, respectable and aspiring, you attempt to force industrial enterprise, in a large measure, upon the Slave States, do you not see that your system of slave labor must yield? To foster commerce and industry in the Slave States for the purpose of protecting Slavery—would it not be like letting the sun-light into a room which you want to keep dark? Hence the Slave States can never become commercially and industrially independent as long as they remain Slave States. They will always be obliged to buy from others, and others will do their carrying trade. At present they do their business with friends, who are united to them by bonds of Union. They speak of dissolving that Union; then, as now, they will be obliged to transact the same business with us, their nearest neighbors, for if they could do otherwise they would have done so long ago. Would they prefer by the dissolution of the Union to make enemies of those on whom they will always be commercially and industrially dependent?

Thus, you see, would the dissolution of the Union in all points of dispute defeat the very object for which the South might feel inclined to attempt it. It would effect just the contrary of what it was intended for; and indeed, if there is a party that can logically and consistently advocate the dissolution of the Union, it is the party

of extreme Abolitionists who desire to extinguish Slavery and to punish the South by a sudden and violent crisis. But as to the slave states, as long as they have sense enough to understand their interests, and to appreciate their situation, they may thank their good fortune, if they are suffered to stay in the Union with confederates who are, indeed, not willing to sacrifice their own principles and interests to Slavery, but by the radiating influence of their own growth and energy will at least, draw the Southern States, also, upon the road of progressive development.

But we are told that the people of the Slave States are a warlike race, and that they will gain, by force, what we are unwilling peaceably to concede. War! What a charm there is in that word for a people of colonels and generals! Well, since that old German monk invented that insignificant black powder which blew the strongholds of feudalism into the air, war falls more and more under the head of mathematical sciences. Don Quixote, who, undoubtedly, would have been a hero in the seventh century, would certainly be the most egregious fool in the nineteenth. I have nothing to say about the bravery of the Southern people, for aught I care they may be braver than they pretend to be; but I invite them candidly to open their eyes, like sensible men.

I will not compare the resources of the South, in men and money, to those of the North, although statistical statements would demonstrate the overwhelming superiority of the latter. We can afford to be liberal, and for argument sake, admit that the South will equal the North in numbers; and if they insist upon it, excel us in martial spirit. But it requires very little knowledge of military matters to understand that, aside from numbers, equipment, courage, and discipline, the strength of an army consists in its ability to concentrate its forces, at all times, upon the decisive point. Providence is on the side of the big battalions, said Napoleon. That means not that victory will always be with the most numerous army, but with that which is always able to appear in strength where the decisive blow is to be struck.

An army that is always scattered over a large surface is, properly speaking, no army at all. Even by a much less numerous, but concentrated enemy, it will be beaten in detail, division after division; it is defeated before having lost a man. This is plain.

The South thinks of going to war for the benefit and protection of Slavery. But Slavery is not merely an abstract principle; Slavery consists materially in the individual slaves—in so and so many millions of human chattels scattered over so and so many thousands of square miles. In order to protect Slavery, it is essential that the slaveholders be protected in the possession of their slaves.

I say, therefore, that Slavery cannot be protected in general, without being protected in detail. But how can you protect it in detail? By guarding fifteen hundred miles of northern frontier, and two thousand miles of seacoast against an enemy who is perfectly free in his movements, and aided by an extensive railroad system always able to concentrate his forces wherever he pleases? It is impossible; the dullest understanding sees it. It may be said that it will not be necessary; indeed, for the Free States it would not; they may, in order to concentrate their forces, expose their territory; for the damages done by an invasion is easily repaired. The retreating invader cannot carry the liberties of the invaded country away with him. [Cheers.] Not so with Slavery. A northern Anti-Slavery army, or even a small flying corps invading a Slaveholding State would perhaps not systematically liberate the Slaves, but at all events it would hardly squander much time and health in catching the runaway. The probability, therefore, is that wherever a Northern army appears, the Slaves disappear, and Slavery with them—at least for the time being. Invade a Free State and the restoration of liberty, after the attack is repulsed, requires only the presence of freemen. But the restoration of Slavery will require capital; that capital consisted principally in the Slaves; the Slaves have run away, and with them the capital necessary for the restoration of Slavery.

The Slave States, therefore, cannot expose their territory without leaving unprotected the institution for the protection of which the war was undertaken. They have to cover thousands and thousands of vulnerable points, for every plantation is an open wound, every negro cabin a sore. Every border or seaboard Slave State will need her own soldiers and more too, for her own protection; and where will be the material for the concentrated army? Scattered over thousands of miles without the possibility of concentration.

Besides, the Slave States harbor a dangerous enemy within their own boundaries, and that is Slavery itself. Imagine they are at war with an Anti-Slavery people, whom they have exasperated by their own hostility. What will be the effect upon the slaves? The question is not whether the North will instigate a slave rebellion, for I suppose they will not; the question is, whether they can prevent it, and I think they cannot. But the mere anticipation of a negro insurrection (and the heated imagination of the slaveholder will discover symptoms of a rebellious spirit in every trifle) will paralyze the whole South. Do you remember the effect of John Brown's attempt? The severest blow he struck at the Slave Power was not that he disturbed a town and killed several citizens, but that he revealed the weakness of the whole South. Let Governor Wise, of Virginia, carry out his threatened invasion of the Free States, not with 23, but with 2,300 followers at his heels—what will be the result? As long as they behave themselves we shall let them alone; but as soon as they create any disturbance they will be put into the station-house; and the next day we shall read in the newspapers of some Northern city, among the reports of the police court: Henry A. Wise and others, for disorderly conduct, fined $5 [laughter and applause]; or, if he has made an attempt on any man's life, or against our institutions, he will most certainly find a Northern jury proud enough to acquit him on the ground of incorrigible mental derangement. [Continued laughter and applause.] Our pictorial prints will have material for carricatures for two issues, and a burst of laughter will ring to the skies from Maine to California. And there is the end of it. But behold John Brown with 23 men raising a row at Harper's Ferry; the whole South frantic

with terror; the whole State of Virginia in arms; troops marching and countermarching as if the battle of Austerlitz was to be fought over again; innocent cows shot at as bloodthirsty invaders, and even the evening song of the peaceful whip-poorwills mistaken for the battle-cry of rebellion [incessant laughter]; and those are the men who will expose themselves to the chances of a war with an Anti-Slavery people! Will they not look upon every captain as a John Brown, and every sergeant and private as a Coppic or Stevens? They will not have men enough to quiet their fears at home; what will they have to oppose to the enemy? Every township will want its home regiment, every plantation its garrison; and what will be left for the field army? No sooner will a movement of concentration be attempted than the merest panic will undo and frustrate it forever. Themistocles might say that Greece was on his ships; a French general might say that the Republic was in his camp; but Slavery will be neither on the ships nor in the camp; it will be spread defenseless over thousands of square miles. This will be their situation; either they concentrate their forces, and Slavery will be exposed everywhere; or they do not concentrate them, and their strength will be nowhere. They want war? Let them try it! They will try it but once. And thus it turns out, that the very same thing that would be the cause of the war, would at the same time disable them to carry on the war. The same institution that wants protection, will at the same time disarm its protectors. Yes, Slavery which can no longer be defended with arguments, can no longer be defended with arms.

There is your dissolution of the Union. The Southern States cannot desire it, for it would defeat the very objects for which it might be undertaken; they cannot attempt it, for Slavery would lay them helpless at the feet of the North. Slavery, which makes it uncomfortable to stay in the Union, makes it impossible for them to go out of it. What, then, will the South do in case of a Republican victory? I answer that question with another one: what *can* the South do in case of a Republican victory? Will there be a disturbance? The people of the South themselves will have to put it down. Will they submit? Not to Northern dictation, but to their own good sense. They have considered us their enemies as long as they ruled us; they will find out that we are their friends as soon as we cease to be their subjects. They have dreamed so long of the blessings of Slavery; they will open their eyes again to the blessings of Liberty. They will discover that they are not conquered, but liberated. Will Slavery die out? As surely as Freedom will *not* die out.

Slaveholders of America, I appeal to you. Are you really in earnest when you speak of perpetuating Slavery? Shall it never cease? Never? Stop and consider where you are, and in what days you live.

This is the nineteenth century. Never, since mankind has a recollection of times gone by, has the human mind disclosed such wonderful powers. The hidden forces of nature we have torn from their mysterious concealment and yoked them into the harness of usefulness; they carry our thoughts over slender wires to distant nations; they draw our wagons over the highways of trade; they pull the gigantic oars of our ships; they set in motion the iron fingers of our machinery; they will soon plow our fields and gather our crops. The labor of the brain has exalted to a mere bridling and controlling of natural forces the labor of the hand—and you think you can perpetuate a system which reduces *man*, however degraded, yet capable of development, to the level of a soulless machine?

This is the world of the nineteenth century. The last remnants of feudalism in the old world are fast disappearing. The Czar of Russia, in the fullness of his imperial power, is forced to yield to the irresistible mark of human progress, and abolishes serfdom. Even the Sultan of Turkey can no longer maintain the barbarous customs of the Moslem against the pressure of the century, and slavery disappears. And you, citizens of a republic, you think you can arrest the wheels of progress with your Dred Scott decisions and Democratic platforms! [Enthusiastic cheers.]

Look around you and see how lonesome you are in this wide world of ours. As far as modern civilization throws its rays, what people, what class of society, is there like you? Cry out into the world your wild and guilty fantasy of property in man, and every echo responds with a cry of horror or contempt; every breeze, from whatever point of the compass it may come, brings you a verdict of condemnation. There is no human heart that sympathizes with your cause, unless it sympathizes with the cause of despotism in every form. There is no human voice to cheer you on in your struggle; there is no human eye that has a tear for your reverses; no link of sympathy between the common cause of the great human brotherhood and you. You hear of emancipation in Russia, and wish it should fail. You hear of Italy rising, and fear the spirit of liberty should become contagious. Where al. mankind rejoices, you tremble. Where all mankind love, you hate. Where all mankind curses, you sympathize.

And in this appalling solitude you stand alone against a powerful world, alone against a great century, fighting, hopeless as the struggle of the Indians against the onward march of civilization. Use all the devices which the inventive genius of despotism may suggest, and yet how can you resist? In every little village shool house, the little children who learn to read and write are plotting against you; in every laboratory of science, in every machine shop, the human mind is working the destruction of your idol. You cannot make an attempt to keep pace with the general progress of mankind without plotting against yourselves. Every steam whistle, every puffing locomotive, is sounding the shriek of liberty into your ears. From the noblest instincts of our hearts down to sordid greediness of gain, every impulse of human nature is engaged in this universal conspiracy. How can you resist? Where are your friends in the North? Your ever ready supporters are scattered to the winds, as by enchantment, never to unite again. Hear them, trying to save their own fortunes, swear with treacherous eagerness that they have nothing in common with you. And your opponents? Your boasts have lost their charm, your threats have lost their terrors upon them. The attempt is idle to cloak the sores of Lazarus with the lion skin

of Hercules. We know you. Every one of your boasts is understood as a disguised moan of weakness—every shout of defiance as a disguised cry for mercy. That game is played out. Do not deceive yourselves. This means not only the destruction of a party—this means the defeat of a cause. Be shrewder than the shrewdest, braver than the bravest—it is all in vain; your cause is doomed.

And in the face of all this you insist upon hugging, with dogged stubbornness, your fatal infatuation? Why not, with manly boldness, swing round into the grand march of progressive humanity? You say it cannot be done to-day. Can it be done to-morrow? Will it be easier twenty, fifty years hence, when the fearful increase of the negro population will have aggravated the evils of Slavery a hundred-fold, and with it the difficulties of its extinction? Did you ever think of this? The final crisis will come, with the inexorable certainty of fate, the more terrible the longer it is delayed. Will you content yourselves with the criminal words, "After me, the deluge?" Is that the inheritance you mean to leave to coming generations? an inheritance of disgrace, crime, blood, destruction? Hear me, slaveholders of America! If you have no sense of right, no appreciation of your own interests, I entreat, I implore you, have at least pity for your children!

I hear the silly objection, that your sense of honor forbids you to desert your cause. Sense of honor! Imagine a future generation standing around the tombstone of the bravest of you, and reading the inscription: "Here lies a gallant man, who lived and died true to the cause—of human Slavery." What will the verdict be? His very progeny will disown him, and exclaim, "He must have been either a knave or a fool!" There is not one of you who, if he could rise from the dead a century hence, would not gladly exchange his epitaph for that of the meanest of those who were hung at Charlestown.

Sense of honor! Since when has it become dishonorable to give up the errors of yesterday for the truths of to-day? to prevent future disasters by timely reforms? Since when has it ceased to be the highest glory to sacrifice one's prejudices and momentary advantages upon the altar of the common weal? But those who seek their glory in stubbornly resisting what is glorious, must find their end in inglorious misery.

I turn to you, Republicans of Missouri: Your countrymen owe you a debt of admiration and gratitude to which my poor voice can give but a feeble expression. You have undertaken the noble task of showing the people of the North that the slaveholding States themselves contain the elements of regeneration; and of demonstrating to the South how that regeneration can be effected. You have inspired the wavering masses with confidence in the practicbilitay of our ideas. To the North you have given encouragement; to the South you have set an example. Let me entreat you not to underrate your noble vocation. Struggle on, brave men! The anxious wishes of millions are hovering around you. Struggle on, until the banner of emancipation is planted upon the Capitol of your state, and one of the proudest chapters of our history will read: Missouri led the van, and the nation followed!

THE

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

Resolved, That we, the delegated representatives of the Republican electors of the United States, in Convention assembled, in discharge of the duty we owe to our constituents and our country, unite in the following declarations:

1. That the history of the nation during the last four years has fully established the propriety and necessity of the organization and perpetuation of the Republican party, and that the causes which called it into existence are permanent in their nature, and now, more than ever before, demand its peaceful and constitutional triumph.

2. That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution—"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed"—is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions; and that the Federal Constitution, the Rights of the States, and the Union of the States, must and shall be preserved.

3. That to the Union of the States this nation owes its unprecedented increase in population, its surprising development of material resources, its rapid augmentation of wealth, its happiness at home and its honor abroad, and we hold in abhorrence all schemes for Disunion, come from whatever source they may: and we congratulate the country that no Republican Member of Congress has uttered or countenanced the threats of Disunion so often made by Democratic Members, without rebuke and with applause from their political associates; and we denounce those threats of Disunion, in case of a popular overthrow of their ascendancy, as denying the vital principles of a free government, and as an avowal of contemplated treason which it is the imperative duty of an indignant people sternly to rebuke and forever silence.

4. That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of powers on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

5. That the present Democratic Administration has far exceeded our worst apprehensions, in its measureless subserviency to the exactions of a sectional interest, as especially evinced in its desperate exertions to force the infamous Lecompton Constitution upon the protesting people of Kansas; in construing the personal relation between master and servant to involve an unqualified property in persons; in its attempted enforcement, everywhere, on land and sea, through the intervention of Congress and of the Federal Courts, of the extreme pretensions of a purely local interest; and in its general and unvarying abuse of the power entrusted to it by a confiding people.

6. That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal Government; that a return to rigid economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the systematic plunder of the public treasury by favored partisans; while the recent startling developments of frauds and corruptions at the Federal Metropolis, show that an entire change of administration is imperatively demanded.

7. That the new dogma that the Constitution, of its own force, carries slavery into any or all of the Territories of the United States, is a dangerous political heresy, at

variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself, with cotemporaneous exposition, and with legislative and judicial precedent; is revolutionary in its tendency, and subversive of the peace and harmony of the country.

8. That the normal condition of all the territory of the United States is that of freedom; that, as our republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that "no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law," it becomes our duty, by legislation, whenever such legislation is necessary, to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it; and we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States.

9. That we brand the recent reopening of the African slave-trade, under the cover of our national flag, aided by perversions of judicial power, as a crime against humanity and a burning shame to our country and age; and we call upon Congress to take prompt and efficient measures for the total and final suppression of that execrable traffic.

10. That in the recent vetoes, by their Federal Governors, of the acts of the Legislatures of Kansas and Nebraska prohibiting slavery in those Territories, we find a practical illustration of the boasted Democratic principle of Non-Intervention and Popular Sovereignty embodied in the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and a demonstration of the deception and fraud involved therein.

11. That Kansas should, of right, be immediately admitted as a State under the Constitution recently formed and adopted by her people, and accepted by the House of Representatives.

12. That, while providing revenue for the support of the general government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the working men liberal wages, to agriculture remunerating prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence.

13. That we protest against any sale or alienation to others of the public lands held by actual settlers, and against any view of the Free Homestead policy which regards the settlers as paupers or suppliants for public bounty; and we demand the passage by Congress of the complete and satisfactory Homestead measure which has already passed the House.

14. That the Republican party is opposed to any change in our Naturalization Laws or any State legislation by which the rights of citizenship hitherto accorded to immigrants from foreign lands shall be abridged or impaired; and in favor of giving a full and efficient protection to the rights of all classes of citizens, whether native or naturalized, both at home and abroad.

15. That appropriations by Congress for River and Harbor improvements of a national character, required for the accommodation and security of an existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution and justified by the obligation of Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

16. That a Railroad to the Pacific Ocean is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country; that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction; and that, as preliminary thereto, a daily Overland Mail should be promptly established.

17. Finally, having thus set forth our distinctive principles and views, we invite the co-operation of all citizens, however differing on other questions, who substantially agree with us in their affirmance and support.

SUPPLEMENTARY RESOLUTION.

Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with those men who have been driven, some from their native States and others from the States of their adoption, and are now exiled from their homes on account of their opinions; and we hold the Democratic party responsible for this gross violation of that clause of the Constitution which declares that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

ADOPTED AT CHICAGO, MAY 17, 1860.

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS, No. 12

The National Divergence and Return.

SPEECH

OF

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

AT

DETROIT, SEPTEMBER 4, 1860.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

We claim that our political system is a judicious one, and that we are an intelligent and virtuous people. The government ought therefore not only to secure respect and good will abroad, but also to produce good order, contentment and harmony at home. It fails to attain these ends. The Canadians certainly neither envy nor love us. All the Independent American powers from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn, while they strive to construct governments for themselves after our models, fear, and many of them hate us. European nations do indeed revere our constitutions and admire our progress, but they generally agree in pronouncing us inconsistent with our organic principle, and capricious. The President inveighs against corruption among the people. The immediate representatives of the people in Congress, charge the President with immoral practices, and the President protests against their action as subversive of the Executive prerogative. The House of Representatives organizes itself convulsively amid confessed dangers of popular commotion. The Senate listens unsurprised, and almost without excitement, to menaces of violence, secession and disunion. Frauds and violence in the territories are palliated and rewarded. Exposure and resistance to them are condemned and punished, while the just, enlightened and reasonable will of the people there, though constitutionally expressed, is circumvented, disobeyed and disregarded. States watch anxiously for unlawful intrusion and invasion by citizens of other states, while the Federal Courts fail to suppress piracies on the high seas, and even on our own coasts. The government of the Union, courts and submits to state espionage of the Federal mails, while the states scarcely attempt to protect the personal rights of citizens of other states, peacefully pursuing harmless occupations within their fraternal jurisdictions.

Are the people satisfied and content? Let their several parties and masses answer. Certainly you, the Republi ans of Michigan, as well as the Republicans throughout the whole country, are not satisfied. But you are interested in a change of administration, and therefore perhaps prejudiced. Ask then, the Constitutional Union men, few and inefficient indeed here, but numerous and energetic elsewhere. They are not satisfied. If they were they would not be engaged as they are now, in a hopeless attempt to organize a new party without any principles at all, after their recent failures to combine such a party on obnoxious principles. But they also are interested and possibly prejudiced like the Republicans. Appeal then to the Democratic party, which enjoys and wields the patronage and power of the Federal Government. Even the Democrats are no less dissatisfied. They certainly are dissatisfied with the Republicans, with the National Union men, with their own administration, with each other, and as I think even individually, with themselves. The North is not satisfied. Its masses want a suppression of the African slave trade, and an effectual exclusion of slavery from the territories, so that all the new and future states, may surely be free states. The South is not satisfied. Its masses by whatever means, and at whatever cost, desire the establishment and protection of slavery in the terri-

tories, so that none of the new states may fail to become slave states. The East is discontented with the neglect of its fishery, manufacture and navigation, and the West is impatient under the operation of a national policy, hostile to its agricultural, mining and social developments. What government in the world but ours, has persistently refused to improve rivers, construct harbors and establish light houses, for the protection of its commerce? New and anomalous combinations of citizens appear, in the North justifying armed instigators of civil and servile war, in the South devising means for the disruption and dismemberment of the Union. It is manifest, that we are suffering in the respect and confidence of foreign states, and that disorder and confusion are more flagrant among ourselves now than ever before.

I do not intend to be understood that these evils are thus far productive of material suffering or intolerable embarrassment, much less that the country is, as so many extravagant persons say, on the high road to civil war or dissolution. On the contrary, this fair land we live in is so blessed with all the elements of human comfort and happiness, and its citizens are at once so loyal and wise and so well surrounded by yet unbroken guaranties of civil and religious liberty, that our experience of misrule at the very worst never becomes so painful as to raise the question how much more of public misery we can endure; but it leaves us at liberty to stop now as always heretofore with the inquiry how much more of freedom, prosperity and honor, we can secure by the practice of greater wisdom and higher virtue? Discontentment is the wholesome fruit of a discovery of maladministration, and conviction of public error is here at least always a sure harbinger of political reform.

Martin Van Buren, they say, is writing a review of his own life, and our time, for posthumous uses. If it is not disrespectful, I should like to know now the conclusions he draws from the national events he has seen, and of which he has been an important part; for he is a shrewd observer, with advantages of large and long experience. To me it seems that the last forty years have constituted a period of signal and lamentable failure in the efforts of statesmen to adjust and establish a federal policy for the regulation of the subject of slavery in its relations to the Union. In this view I regard it as belonging to the office of a statesman not merely to favor an immediate and temporary increase of national wealth, and an enlargement of national territory, but also to fortify, so far as the prescribed constitutional limits of his action may allow, the influences of knowlege and humanity; to abate popular prejudices and passions, by modifying or removing their causes; to ascertain and disclose the operation of general laws and to study and reveal the social tendencies of the age, and by combining the past with the present, while giving free play all the time to the reciprocating action of the many co-existing moral forces, to develop that harmonious system which actually prevails in the apparent chaos of human affairs; and so to gain something in the way of assurance as to the complexion of that futurity towards which, since our country is destined to endure, and insomuch as we desire that it may be immortal, our thoughts are so vehemently driven even by the selfish as well as by the generous principles of our nature.

I have understood that John Quincy Adams, the purest and wisest statesman I ever knew, died despairing of a peaceful solution of the problem of slavery, on which he was so intently engaged throughout his public service. If we may judge from the absolute failures of Mr. Van Buren, Mr. Polk, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Buchanan in the respect I have mentioned, and if we take into consideration also the systems which Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Benton, Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster severally recommended, and which have subsequently failed to be adopted, we may perhaps conclude that the difficulties of establishing a satisfactory and soothing policy have overtasked even our wisest and most eminent statesmen. They certainly have been neither incapable nor selfish men. No age or country has been illustrated by public characters of greater genius, wisdom and virtue

It is easy to see, fellow citizens, that the failure has resulted not from the faults of our statesmen, but from the peculiar constitutions and characters of political parties, on which they relied for power. Solid, enduring and constant parties, inspired by love of country, reverence for virtue and devotion to human liberty, bold in their conceptions of measures, moderate in success, and resolute throughout reverses, are essential to effective and beneficent administration in every free state. Unanimity, even in a wise, just and necessary policy, can never be expected in any country all at once, and without thorough debate and earnest conflicts of opinion. All public movements are therefore undertaken and prosecuted through the agencies, not of individuals, but of parties regulated, excited and moderated, as occasion may require, by their representatives. He who proposes means so impracticable that he can win no party to their support, may be a philanthropist, but he cannot be a statesman; and even when the leader in administration is thus sustained, he is, although never so earnest or wise, everywhere and at all times inefficient and imbecile, just in the degree that the party on which he depends, is inconstant, vacillating, timid or capricious. What has become of the several political parties, which have flourished within your time and mine? That dashing, unterrified, defiant party, whose irresistible legions carried the honest and intrepid hero of New Orleans on their shields, through so many civil encounters—that generous though not unprejudiced Whig party, which apprehensive of perpetual danger from too radical policies of administration, so often with unabated chivalry and enthusiasm, magically recombined its bruised and scattered columns, even when a capricious fortune had turned its rare and hard won triumphs into defeats more disastrous than the field fights which it had lost —the recent American party, that sprang at one bound from ten thousand dark chambers and which seemed only yesterday at the very point of carrying the government by a *coup de main*. All these parties, that for brief periods seemed so strong and so unchanging, have perished, leaving no deep impression on the history of the country they aimed to direct and rule forever. The Democratic party too that has clothed itself so complacently with the pleasant traditions of all preceding parties, and combined so felicitously

the most popular of our national sympathies with the most inveterate and repulsive of our conservative interests, that has won the South so dexterously, by stimulating its maddest ambition, and yet has held the North so tenaciously and so long, by awakening its wildest and most demoralizing fears. What is its condition? It is distinguished in fortune from its extinguished rivals only, by the circumstance that both portions of its crew, divided as the hulk breaks into two not unequal parts, retain sufficient energy in their despair, to seize on the drifting wrecks of other parties, and by a cunning though hopeless carpentery, to frame wretched and rickety rafts on which to sustain themselves for one dark night more on the tempestuous sea of national politics. All these parties, it is now manifest, were organized not specially to establish justice and maintain freedom and equality among an honest, jealous and liberty loving people, but to achieve some material public advantage of temporary importance, or to secure the advancement of some chief to whose discretion, as if the government were an elective despotism instead of a Republic, the distribution of its patronage and the direction of its affairs should be implicitly confided. They did indeed out of respect or fear of generous reforms, often affect to express elevated principles and generous sentiments in their carefully elaborated creeds, but these creeds nevertheless, even when not ambiguously expressed, were from time to time revised and qualified and modified, so that at last the interpreters who alone had them by heart, and were able to repeat them, were found perverting the constitution in its most unequivocal parts, and most palpable meaning, disparaging and rejecting the Declaration of Independence, and stultifying the founders of the Republic. The parties thus constituted, dependent not on any national or even on any natural sentiment, but on mere discipline for their cohesion, and coming at last through constant demoralization, to assume that capital and not labor, property and not liberty is the great interest of every people, and that religion conversant only with the relations of men to an unseen and future world, must be abjured in their conduct towards each other on earth, have finally discarded justice and humanity from their systems, broken up nearly all the existing combinations for spiritual ends, and attempted to conduct affairs of government on principles equally in violation of the constitution and of the eternal laws of God's Providence for the regulation of the Universe.

These views of the characters of our modern parties are by no means newly conceived on my part. In that high and intensely exciting debate in Congress in the year 1850, which, overruling the administration of General Taylor, brought the two then dominating parties into a compromise at the time solemnly pronounced final, irrevocable and eternal, but which was nevertheless scattered to the winds of Heaven only four years afterward, the great statesman of Kentucky denounced party spirit as he assumed it to be raging throughout the country, as pregnant with the imminent and intolerable disasters of civil war and national dissolution. I ventured then to reply that, in my humble judgment, it was not a conflict of parties that we then were seeing and hearing, but it was, on the contrary, the agony of distracted parties, a convulsion resulting from the too narrow foundations of both of the great parties and of all the parties of the day, foundations that had been laid in compromises of natural justice and human rights—that a new and great question—a moral question transcending the too narrow creeds of existing parties had arisen—that the public conscience was expanding with it, and the green withes of party combinations were giving way and breaking under the pressure—that it was not the union that was decaying and dying as was supposed, of the fever of party spirit, but that the two great parties were smitten with paralysis, fatal indeed to them unless they should consent to be immediately renewed and re-organized, borrowing needful elements of health and vigor from a cordial embrace with the humane spirit of the age.

But, fellow-citizens, to exempt our statesmen by casting blame on our political parties, does not reach, but only approximates the real source of responsibility. All of these parties have been composed of citizens, not a few but many citizens, in the aggregate, all the citizens of the Republic. They were not ignorant, willful or dishonest citizens, but sincere, faithful and useful members of the State. The parties of our country, what are they at any time, but ourselves, the people of our country? Thus the faults of past administration and of course the responsibility for existing evils, are brought directly home to yourselves and myself—to the whole people. This is no hard saying. The wisest, justest and most virtuous of men occasionally errs and has need daily to implore the Divine Goodness that he be not led further into temptation; and just so the wisest, justest and most virtuous of nations often unconsciously lose and depart from their ancient approved and safer ways. Is there any society, even of Christians, that has never had occasion to reform its practice, retrace its too careless steps and discard heresies that have corrupted its accepted faith? What was the English revolution of 1648, but a return from the dark and dangerous road of absolutism? What the French revolution, but a mighty convulsion, that while it carried a brave, enlightened, and liberty-loving nation backward on their progress of three hundred years, owed all its horrors to the delay which had so long postponed the needed reaction!

A national departure always happens, when a great emergency occurs unobserved and unfelt, bringing the necessity for the attainment of some new and important object, which can only be secured through the inspiration of some new but great and generous national sentiment.

Let us see if we can ascertain in the present case, when our departure from the right and safe way occurred. Certainly it was not in the Revolutionary age. The nation then experienced and felt a stern necessity, perceived and resolutely aimed at a transcendently sublime object, and accepted cheerfully the awakening influences of an intensely moving and generous principle. The necessity was deliverance from British oppression; the object, independence; the principle, the inalienable rights of man. The revolution was a success, because the country had in Adams and Jefferson and Washington and their associates, the leaders, and in the Whigs, the party needful for this crisis, and these were sustained by the people.

Our departure was not at the juncture of the establishment of the constitution. The country

then had and owned a new and overpowering necessity, perceived and demanded a new object and adopted a new and most animating principle. The necessity, the escape from anarchy; the object, Federal Union; the principle, fraternity of the American people. The Constitution with the Ordinance of 1787, practically a part of it, was not a failure, because HAMILTON, JAY and MADISON were competent, and the Federal party was constant, and the people gave it a confiding and generous support.

It was not in 1800, that the national deviation took place. Then were disclosed a new public necessity, new object, and new principle. A separation and removal of aristocratic checks and interests from the mechanism of our republican institutions. The needed reform did not fail, because JEFFERSON and GEORGE CLINTON, with their associates braved all resistance, the Republican party defended, and the people sustained them.

Again the departure did not occur in 1812. Then was discovered a farther necessity, bringing into view a farther object and introducing yet another new and noble principle of action. The necessity, a vindication of national rights; the object, freedom of intercourse with mankind; the principle, the defence of our homes and our honor. The war of 1812 was a success, because CLAY, CALHOUN and TOMPKINS did not shrink from the trial; the Republican party approved and the people sustained them.

In 1820, however, the nation had unconsciously reached and entered a new stage in its successful career, namely, that of expansion. By purchases from France and Spain it had extended its borders from the St. Mary's southward around the peninsula of Florida, and from the Mississippi to the Rocky Mountains, an expansion to be afterwards indefinitely continued. We all know the advantages of expansion. They are augmented wealth and population. But we all know equally well, if we will only reflect, that no new advantage is ever gained in national more than in individual life without exposure to some new danger. What then is the danger which attends expansion? It is nothing less and can be nothing less than an increase of the strain upon the bonds of the Union. The time had come to organize government finally in the newly acquired territory of Louisiana, on principles that should be applied thereafter in all cases of further expansion. This necessity brought into glaring light a new object, namely, since the only existing cause of mutual alienation among the states was slavery, which was already carefully circumscribed by the ordinance of 1787, that anomalous institution must now be further circumscribed by extending the ordinance to cover the new states to be established in the Louisianian purchase. To this end a new and humane impulse naturally moved the country, namely, the freedom of human labor.

But although statesmen qualified for the crisis appeared, no party stood forth to support them with constancy, and the country, after a temporary glow of free soil excitement, subsided into cold indifference—and so a compromise was made which divided the newly acquired domain between free labor and capital in slaves, between freedom and slavery, a memorable compromise, which, after a trial of only thirty-four years, proved to be effective only in its concessions to slavery, while its greater guaranties of freedom were found unavailing and worthless. History says that the compromise of 1820 was necessary to save the Union from disruption. I do not dispute history, nor debate the settled moral questions of the past. I only lament that it was necessary, if indeed it was so. History tells us that the course then adopted was wise. I do not controvert it. I only mourn the occurrence of even one case, most certainly the only one that ever did happen, in which the way of wisdom has failed to be also the way of pleasantness, and the path of peace. It was in 1820, therefore, that the national deviation began. We have continued ever since the divergent course then so inconsiderately entered, until at last we have reached a point, where, amid confusion, bewilderment and mutual recriminations, it seems alike impossible to go forward or to return. We have added territory after territory, and region after region with the customary boldness of feebly resisted conquerors, not merely neglecting to keep slavery out of our new possessions, but actually removing all the barriers against it which we found standing at the times of conquest. In doing this we have defied the moral opinions of mankind, overturned the laws and systems of our fathers, and dishonored their memories by declaring that the unequaled and glorious constitution which they gave us, carries with it, as it attends our eagles, not freedom and personal rights to the oppressed, but slavery and a hateful and baleful commerce in slaves, wherever we win a conquest by sea or land over the whole habitable globe.

While we must now, in deference to history, excuse the first divergence, it is manifest that our subsequent persistence in the same course has been entirely unnecessary and unjustifiable. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Canada, what remains of Mexico, all the West Indies and Central America, are doubtless very desirable, but we have patiently waited for them, and are now likely to wait until they can be acquired without receiving slavery with them, or extending it over them. Nay, all the resistance we have ever met in adding Spanish American territories to our Republic, has resulted from our willful and perverse purpose of subverting freedom there, to blight the fairest portion of the earth, when we found it free, by extending over it our only national agency of desolation. We may doubtless persist still further. We may add conquest to conquest, for resistance to our ambition daily grows more and more impossible, until we surpass in extent and apparent strength the greatest empires of ancient or modern times, all the while enlarging the area of African bondage; but after our already ample experience, I think no one will be bold enough to deny that we equally increase the evils of discontent and the dangers of domestic faction.

Fellow-citizens, while I lament the national divergence I have thus described, I do not confess it to be altogether inexcusable. Much less do I blame any one or more of our politicians or parties, while exempting others. All are, in different degrees perhaps, responsible alike, and all have abundant, if not altogether adequate excuses. Deviation once begun, without realizing the immediate presence of danger, it was easier to continue on than to return. The country has all the time been growing richer and more prosperous and populous. It was not unnatural that we should disregard warnings of what we were

assured by high though interested authorities, always were distant, improbable and even visionary dangers. It cannot be denied that the African races among us are abject, although their condition, and even their presence here are due not to their will or fault, but to our own, and that they have a direct interest in the question of slavery. How natural has it been to assume that the motive of those who have protested against the extension of slavery, was an unnatural sympathy with the negro instead of what it always has really been, concern for the welfare of the white man. There are few, indeed, who ever realize that the whole human race suffers somewhat in the afflictions and calamities which befall the humblest and most despised of its members.

The argument, though demanding the most dispassionate calmness and kindness, has too often been conducted with anger and broken out into violence.

Moreover, alarms of disunion were sounded, and strange political inventions like the floating fire ships sent down the St. Lawrence, by the besieged in Quebec, to terrify the army of Wolfe on the Island of St. Louis, appeared suddenly before us whenever we proposed to consider in good earnest, the subject of Federal slavery.

We love and we ought to love the fellowship of our slaveholding brethren. How natural, therefore, has it been to make the concessions so necessary to silence their complaints, rather than by seeming impracticability in what was thought a matter of indifference, to lose such genial companionship. Again, at least, present peace and safety together, with some partial guaranties and concessions of freedom, were from time to time obtained by compromises. Who had the right, or who the presumption to say with the certainty of being held responsible for casting imputations of bad faith upon our southern brethren, that these compromises would, when their interests should demand it, be disavowed and broken ?

Other nations, we have assumed, are jealous of our growing greatness. They have censured us, perhaps with unjust asperity, for our apostacy in favor of slavery. How natural and even patriotic has it been on our part to manifest by persistence, our contempt and defiance of such interested and hostile animadversions. Besides, though slavery is indeed now practically a local and peculiar institution of the South, it was not long ago the habit and practice of the whole American people. It is only twenty-five years since our British brethren abolished slavery in their colonies, and only half a century since we or any European nation interdicted the African slave trade. Scarcely three generations have passed away, since the subject of the wrongfulness of slavery first engaged the consideration of mankind.

You and I indeed understand now very well, how it is, that slavery in the territories of the United States, is left open by the constitution to our utmost peaceful opposition, while within the slave states, it is entrenched behind local constitutions beyond the reach of external legislation. But the subject is a complex one, and the great masses of the people to whom it has only been recently presented, and doubtlessly often presented, under unfavorable circumstances, might well desire time for its careful and deliberate examination.

It seems a bold suggestion to say, that a great nation ought to reconsider a practice of forty years' duration; but forty years of a nation's life, are equivalent to only one year in the life of an individual. The thought is at least consistent with political philosophy, for it is not more true that personal persistence in error leads inevitably to ruin, than it is that every nation exists by obedience to the same moral laws which direct individual life, that they are written in its original constitution, and it must continually reform itself according to the spirit of those laws, or perish.

My humble advice, then, fellow citizens, is, that we return and re-establish the original policy of the nation, and henceforth hold, as we did in the beginning, that slavery is and must be only a purely local, temporary and exceptional institution, confined within the slave states where it already exists, while Freedom is the general, normal, enduring and permanent condition of society within the jurisdiction, and under the authority of the Constitution of the United States.

I counsel thus for a simple reason incapable of illumination. Slavery, however it may be at any time or in any place excused, is at all times and everywhere unjust and inhuman in its very nature; while freedom, however it may be at any time or in any place neglected, denied, or abused, is in its nature right, just and beneficent. It can never under any circumstances be wise to persevere voluntarily, in extending or fortifying an institution that is intrinsically wrong or cruel It can never be unwise wherever it is possible, to defend and fortify an existing institution that is founded on the rights of Human Nature. Insomuch as opinions are so materially, and yet so unconsciously affected and modified by time, place and circumstances, we may hold these great truths firmly, without impeaching the convictions or the motives of those who deny them in argument or in practice.

I counsel thus for another reason quite as simple as the first. Knowledge, emulation and independence among the members of a social state are the chief elements of national wealth, strength and power. Ignorance, indolence and bondage of individuals are always sources of national imbecility and decline. All nations in their turns have practised slavery. Most of them have abolished it. The world over, the wealthiest and most powerful nations have been those which tolerated it least, and which earliest and most completely abolished it. Virginia and Texas are thrown into a panic even now by the appearance or even the suspicion of a handful of men within their borders, instigating civil war. Massachusetts and Vermont defied British invasion. backed by treason, eighty years ago.

Thirdly, there is no necessity now to fortify or extend slavery within the United States or on the American continent. All the supposed necessities of that sort ever before known, have passed away forever. Let us briefly review them. With the discovery and conquest of America confessedly came a responsibility to reclaim it from nature and to introduce civilization. Unfortunately Spain and Portugal, the discoverers and conquerors, were of all the European States in the sixteenth century, the worst qualified and least able to colonize. They were neither populous, nor industrious, nor free; but were na

tions of princes and subjects; of soldiers, navigators, nobles, priests, poets and scholars, without merchants, mechanics, farmers, or laborers. The art of navigation was imperfect; its practice dangerous, and the new world that the Pope had divided between his two most loyal crown wearing children was in its natural state pestilential. European emigration was therefore impracticable. In the emergency the conquerors, with ruffian violence, swept off at once the gold and silver ornaments which they found in the temples and on the persons of the natives, ignorant of their European values, and subjugated and enslaved the natives themselves. But these simple children of the forest, like the wild flowers when the hurricane sweeps over the prairies, perished under cruelties so contrary to nature.

The African trade, in prisoners of war spared from slaughter, afforded an alternative. The chiefs sold ten men, women or children, for a single horse. The conquerors of America brought this unnatural merchandise to our coasts. When the English colonists of North America, happily in only a very limited degree, borrowed from their predecessors this bad practice of slavery, they borrowed also its wretched apology, a want of an adequate supply of free labor. It was then thought an exercise of Christian benevolence to rescue the African heathen from eternal suffering in a future state, and through the painful path of earthly bondage to open to him the gates of the celestial paradise. But all this is now changed. We are at last no feeble or sickly colonies, but a great, populous, homogeneous nation, unsurpassed and unequaled in all the elements of colonization and civilization. Free labor here continually increases and abounds, and is fast verging towards European standards of value. There is not one acre too much in our broad domain for the supply of even three generations of our free population, with their certain increase. Immigration from Europe is crowding our own sons into the western region, and this movement is daily augmented by the application of new machines for diminishing mechanical and even agricultural labor. At this very moment, Congress, after a long and obstinate reluctance, finds itself obliged to yield a homestead law to relieve the pressure of labor in the Atlantic States. Certainly, therefore, we have no need and no room for African slaves in the Federal territories. Do you say that we want more sugar and more cotton, and therefore must have more slaves and more slave labor. I answer, first, that no class or race of men have a right to demand sugar, cotton, or any other comfort of human life to be wrung for them, through the action of the Federal Government, from the unrewarded and compulsory labor of any other class or race of men.

I answer, secondly, that we have sugar and cotton enough already for domestic consumption and a surplus of the latter for exportation without any increase of slave territory. Do you say that Europe wants more sugar and cotton than we can now supply? I reply, let then Europe send her free laborers hither, or into Italy, or into the West Indies, or into the East; or if it suit them better, let them engage the natives of cotton growing regions in the old world, to produce cotton and sugar voluntarily and for adequate compensation. Such a course, instead of fortifying and enlarging the sway of slavery here, will leave us free to favor its gradual removal. It will renew or introduce civilization on the shores of the Mediterranean and throughout the coasts of the Indian Ocean. Christianity, more fully developed and better understood now than heretofore, turns with disgust and horror from the employment of force and piracy as a necessary agency of the Gospel.

Fourthly. All the subtle evasions and plausible political theories which have heretofore been brought into the argument for an extension of slavery, have at last been found fallacious and frivolous.

It is unavailing now to say that this government was made by and for white men only, since even slaves owed allegiance to Great Britain before the Revolution equally with white men, and were equally absolved from it by the Revolution, and are not only held to allegiance now under our laws, but are also subjected to taxation and actual representation in every department of the Federal Government. No government can excuse itself from the duty of protecting the extreme rights of every human being, whether foreign or native born, bond or free, whom it compulsorily holds within its jurisdiction. The great fact is now fully realized that the African race here is a foreign and feeble element like the Indians, incapable of assimilation, but not the less, therefore, entitled to such care and protection as the weak everywhere may require from the strong; that it is a pitiful exotic unwisely and unnecessarily transplanted into our fields, and which it is unprofitable to cultivate at the cost of the desolation of the native vinyard. Nor will the argument that the party of slavery is national and that of freedom sectional, any longer avail when it is fully understood, that so far as it is founded in truth, it is only a result of that perversion of the constitution which has attempted to circumscribe freedom, and to make slavery universal throughout the Republic. Equally do the reproaches, invectives and satires of the advocates of slavery extension fail, since it is seen and felt that truth, reason and humanity, can work right on without fanaticism and bear contumely without retaliation. I counsel his course farther, because the combinations of slavery are broken up, and can never be renewed with success. Any new combination must be based on the principle of the Southern Democratic faction, that slavery is inherently just and beneficent, and ought to bo protected, which can no longer be tolerated in the North; or else on the principle of the Northern Democratic faction that slavery is indifferent and unworthy of federal protection, which is insufficient in the South, while the national mind has actually passed far beyond both of these principles, and is settled in the conviction that slavery, whereever and howsoever it exists, exists only to be regretted and deplored.

I counsel this course farther, because the necessity for a return to the old national way has become at last absolute and imperative. We can extend slavery into new territories, and create new slave states only by re-opening the African slave trade; a proceeding which, by destroying all the existing values of the slaves now held in the country, and their increase, would bring the north and the south into complete unanimity in favor of that return.

Finally I counsel that return because a Statesman has been designated who possesses, in an

eminent and most satisfactory degree, the virtues and the qualifications necessary for the leader in so great and generous a movement; and I feel well assured that ABRAHAM LINCOLN will not fail to re-inaugurate the ancient constitutional policy in the administration of the government successfully, because the Republican party, after ample experience, has at last acquired the courage and the constancy necessary to sustain him, and because I am satisfied that the people, at last fully convinced of the wisdom and necessity of the proposed reformation, are prepared to sustain and give it effect.

But when it shall have been accomplished, what may we expect then; what dangers must we incur; what disasters and calamities must we suffer? I answer no dangers, disasters or calamities. All parties will acquiesce, because it will be the act of the people, in the exercise of their sovereign power, in conformity with the constitution and laws, and in harmony with the eternal principles of justice, and the benignant spirit of the age in which we live. All parties and all sections will alike rejoice in the settlement of a controversy, which has agitated the country and disturbed its peace so long. We shall regain the respect and good will of the Nations, and once more, consistent with our principles, and with our ancient character, we shall, with their free consent, take our place at their head, in their advancing progress, towards a higher and more happy, because more humane and more genial civilization.

Destiny of the United States.

SPEECH

DELIVERED BY

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

AT

ST. PAUL, SEPTEMBER 18, 1860.

Fellow Citizens:—One needs to have had something of the experience that it has been my fortune to have, living in a State at an early period of its material development and social improvement, and growing up with its growing greatness in order to appreciate the feeling with which I am oppressed on this, my first entrance into the capital of the State of Minnesota. Every step of my progress since I reached the Northern Mississippi has been attended by an agreeable and great surprise. I had early read the works in which the geographer had described the scenes on which I was entering, and I had studied these scenes in the finest production of art. But still the grandeur, the luxuriance, the benificence, the geniality of this region were entirely unconceived. When I saw these sentinel walls that look down on the Mississippi, seen as I beheld them in their autumnal verdure, just when the earliest tinges of the fall give variety to the luxuriance of the forest, I thought how much of taste and genius had been wasted in celebrating the highlands of Scotland before civilized man had reached the banks of the Mississippi. And then that beautiful Lake Pepin scene at sunset, when the autumnal green of the hills was lost in a deep blue hue that imitates that of the heavens. The genial yellow atmosphere reflected the rays of the setting sun, and the skies above seemed to come down to spread their gorgeous drapery over this scene. It was a piece of upholstery such as no hand but that of nature could have made; and it was but the vestibule to the capital of the State of Minnesota — a State which I have loved, which I ever shall love, for more reasons than time would allow me to mention, but chiefly because it is one of three States which my own voice has been potential in bringing into the federal Union within the time that I have been engaged in the federal councils. Every one of the three was a free State, and I believe, on my soul, that of the whole three Minnesota is the freest of all. (Loud applause.)

I find myself now, for the first time, on the high lands of the centre of the continent of North America, equidistant from the waters of Hudson's Bay and the Gulf of Mexico, from the Atlantic ocean to the ocean in which the sun sets —here, on the spot where spring up, almost side by side, so that they may kiss each other, the two great rivers—the one of which, pursuing its strange, capricious, majestic, vivacious career through cascade and river, and rapid, lake after lake, and river after river; finally, after a course of twenty-five hundred miles, brings your commerce half way to the ports of Europe; and the other, which meandering through woodland and prairie a distance of twenty-five hundred miles, taking in tributary after tributary from the East and from the West, bringing together the waters from the western declivity of the Alleghanies and those which trickle down the Eastern sides of the Rocky Mountains, finds the Atlantic Ocean in the Gulf of Mexico. (Applause.) Here is the central place whence the agriculture of the richest region of North America must bear its tribute to the supplies of the whole world. (Applause.) On the East, all along the shore of Lake Superior, and on the West stretching in one broad plain, in a belt quite across the continent, is a country where State after State is yet to rise, and where the productions for the support of human society in other crowded States must be brought forth. This is, then, a commanding field; but it is as commanding in regard to the destinies of this continent as it is in regard to its commercial future, for power is not to reside permanently on the eastern slope of the Alleghany Mountains, nor in the seaports. Seaports have always been overrun and controlled by the people of the interior. The people of the inland and of the upland—those who inhabit the sources of the mighty waters—are they who

supply them with wealth and power. The power of this government hereafter is not to be established on either the Atlantic or the Pacific coast. The seaports will be the mouths by which we shall communicate and correspond with Europe; but the power that shall speak and shall communicate and express the will of men on this continent is to be located in the Mississippi Valley, and at the sources of the Mississippi and the St. Lawrence. (Loud applause.) In other days, studying what might, perhaps, have seemed to others trifling or visionary, I have cast about for the future, the ultimate, central seat of power of the North American people. I had looked at Quebec and New Orleans, at Washington and at San Francisco, at Cincinnati and at St. Louis, and it had been the result of my best conjecture that the seat of power for North America would be yet found in the valley of Mexico, that the glories of the Aztec capital would be renewed, and that city would become ultimately the Capital of the United States of America. But I have corrected that view, and I now believe that the ultimate last seat of power on this continent will be found somewhere within a radius not very far from the very spot where I stand, at the head of navigation on the Mississippi river. (Loud applause.)

Fellow citizens, I have often seen, but never with great surprise, that on the occasion of a great revival of religion in a community where I happen to live, the oldest, the most devout, the most religious preacher, he whose life had seemed to me and to the world to be best ordered, according to the laws of God, and in affection to the interests of mankind—that such as he discovered, in the heat of this religious excitement, that he had been entirely mistaken in his own experience, and that he now found out, to his great grief and astonishment, that he had never before been converted, and that now, for the first time, he had become a Christian. (Laughter.) While I stand here I almost fall into the notion that I am in the category of that preacher—(laughter)—and that, although I cannot charge myself with having been really a seditious, or even a disloyal citizen, or an unobservant public man, I have yet never exactly understood the duties that I owed to society and the spirit that belongs to an American statesman. This is because I have never, until now, occupied that place whence I could grasp and take in the whole grand panorama of the continent, for the happiness of whose present people and of whose future millions it is the duty of an American statesman to labor. I have often said, and indeed thought, that one would get a very adequate, a very high idea of the greatness of this American republic of ours if he stood, as I have done, on the deck of an American ship-of-war as she sailed the Mediterranean, and, passing through the Ionian Islands, ascended the Adriatic, bearing at the masthead the stripes and stars, that commanded respect and inspired fear, equally among the semi-barbarians of Asia and the most polite and powerful of the nations of Europe—I have often thought that I could lift myself up to the conception of the greatness of this republic of ours by taking my stand on the terrace of the Capitol at Washington, and contemplating the concentration of the political power of the American people, and following out in my imagination the despatches by which that will, after being modified by the executive and legislative departments, went forth as laws and edicts, and ordinances, for the government of a great people. But, after all, no such place as either of these is equal to that which I now occupy.

I seem to myself to stand here on this eminence as the traveler who climbs to the dome of St. Peter's in Rome, and there, through the opening in that dome appears to be in almost direct and immediate communication with the Almighty power that directs and controlls the actions and the wills of men, while he looks down from that eminence on the priests and votaries who vainly try, by poring over books and prayers, to study out the will of the Eternal. So it is with me. I can stand here and look far off in to the Northwest and see the Russian, as he busily occupies himself in establishing seaports and towns, and fortifications, as outposts of the empire of St. Petersburg, and I can say, "Go on; build up your outposts to the Arctic ocean. They will yet become the outposts of my own country, to extend the civilization of the United States in the Northwest." So I look on Prince Rupert's land and Canada, and see how an ingenious people and a capable, enlightened government, are occupied with bridging rivers and making railroads and telegraphs, to develop, organize, create and preserve the British provinces of the north, by the great lakes, the St. Lawrence and around the shores of Hudson's Bay, and I am able to say, "It is very well; you are building excellent States to be hereafter admitted into the American Union." (Applause.) I can look Southward and see, amid all the convulsions that are breaking up the ancient provinces of Spain, the Spanish American republics—see in their decay and dissolution the preparatory stage for their reorganization in free, equal and independent members of the United States of America. Standing on such an eminence and looking with that far distant range of vision, I can now look down on the States and the people of the Atlantic coast—of Maine and Massachusetts, and New York and Pennsylvania, and Virginia and the Carolinas, and Georgia and Louisiana, and Texas, and round by the Pacific coast to California and Oregon—I can hear their disputes, their fretful controversies, their threats that if their own separate interests are not gratified and consulted by the federal government, they will separate from this Union—will secede from it, will dissolve it; and while I hear on their busy sidewalks these clamorous contentions I am able to say, "Peace; be still. These subjects of contention and dispute that so irritate, and anger, and provoke you, are but ephemeral or temporary. These institutions which you so much desire to conserve, and for which you think you would sacrifice the welfare of the people of this continent, are almost as ephemeral as yourselves." *The man is born to-day who will live to see the American Union, the American people—the whole of them—coming into the harmonious understanding that this is the land of the free man—for the free man—that it is the land for the white man; and that whatever elements there are to disturb its present peace or irritate the passions of its possessors will in the end—and that end will come before long—pass away, without capacity in any way to disturb the harmony of or endanger this great Union.* (Applause.)

Fellow citizens, it is under the influence of reflections like these that I thank God here to-day, more fervently than ever, that I live in such a great country as this, and that my lot has been cast in it—not before the period when political society was to be organized, nor yet in that distant period when it is to collapse and fall into ruin, but that I live in the very day and hour when political society is to be effectually organized throughout this entire country. Fellow citizens, we seem here and now to feel, to come into the knowledge of, that high necessity which compels every state in this Union to be, not separated and several States, but one part of the American republic. We see and feel more than ever, when we come up here, that fervent heat of benevolence and love for the region in which our lot is cast, that will not suffer the citizens of Maine, the citizens of South Carolina, the citizens of Texas, or the citizens of Wisconsin or Minnesota, to be aliens to, or enemies of, each other, but which on the other hand compels them to be members of one great political family. Aye, and we see more—how it is that while society is convulsed with the jealousies between native and foreign born in our Atlantic cities and on our Pacific coast, and tormented with the rivalries and jealousies produced by difference of birth, of language and of religion, here in this central point of the republic the German, and the Irishman, and the Italian, and the Frenchman, and the Hollander, becomes, in spite of himself, almost completely, in his own eyes and in his children's, an American citizen. (Applause.) We see and feel, therefore, the unity, in other words, that constitutes, and compels us to constitute, not many nations, not many peoples, but one nation and one people only. (Applause.) Valetudinarians of the North have been in the habit of seeking the sunny skies of the South to restore their wasting frames under consumption; and valetudinarians of the South have been accustomed to seek the skies of Italy for the same relief. Now you see the valetudinarians of the whole continent, from the frozen North and from the burning South, resort to the sources of the Mississippi for an atmosphere which shall reinvigorate and restore them to health. (Applause.) Do you not see and feel here that this atmosphere has another virtue—that when men from Maine and from Carolina, and from Mississippi and from New Hampshire, and from England and Ireland and Scotland, from Germany and from all other portions of the world, come up here into this same valley of the Mississippi, the atmosphere, when it once becomes naturalized to their lungs, becomes the atmosphere not only of health, but of liberty and freedom? (Applause.) *Do we not feel when we come up here that we have not only found the temple and the shrine of freedom, but that we have come into the actual living presence of the Goddess of Freedom?* (Loud Applause.) Once in her presence we see that no less capacious temple could be fit for the worship that is her due.

I wish, my fellow citizens, that all my associates in public life could come up here with me and learn by experience, as I have done, the elevation and serenity of soul which pervade the people of the great Northwest. It is the only region of the United States in which I find fraternity and mutual charity fully developed. (Applause.) Since I first set my foot in the valley of the Upper Mississippi I have met men of all sects and of all religions, men of the republican party and of the democratic party and of the American party, and I have not heard one reproachful word, one disdainful sentiment. I have seen that you can differ, and yet not disagree. (Applause.) I have seen that you can love your parties and the statesmen of your choice, and yet love still more the country, and its rulers, the people—the sovereign people—not the squatter sovereignties, scattered so widecast in distant and remote Territories which you are never to enter, and so devised that they may be sold, and that the Supreme Court of the United States may abolish sovereignty and the sovereigns also. (Laughter.) You love the sovereignty that you possess yourselves, where every man is his own sovereign—the popular sovereignty that belongs to me, and the popular sovereignty that belongs to you, and the equal popular sovereignty that belongs to every other man who is under the government and protection of the United States. (Applause.) Under the influence of such sentiments and feelings as these I scarcely know how to act or speak when I come before you at the command of the people of Minnesota, as a republican. I feel that if we could be but a little more indulgent, a little more patient with each other, a little more charitable, all the grounds on which we disagree would disappear and pass away, just as false popular sovereignty is passing away; and let us all, if we cannot confess ourselves to be all republicans, at least agree that we are American citizens. (Applause.) I see here, moreover, how it is that in spite of sectional and personal ambition, the form and body and spirit of this nation organizes itself and consolidates itself out of the equilibrium of irrepressible and yet healthful political counterbalancing forces, and how out of that equilibrium is produced just exactly that one thing which the interests of the continent and of mankind require should be developed here—and that is a federal republic of separate republican and democratic States.

I see here how little you and I, and those who are wiser and better and greater than you or I, have done, and how little they can do, to produce the very political condition for the people of this continent which they are assuming, and under which they are permanently to remain—and that is the condition of a free people. I see that while we seemed to ourselves to have been trying to do much and to do everything, and while many fancy that they have done a great deal, yet what we have been doing, what we now are doing, what we shall hereafter do, and what we and those who may come after us shall continue to be doing, is just exactly what was necessary to be done, whether we knew it or not, for the interests of humanity on this globe, and therefore it was certain to be done, because necessity is only another expression or name for the higher law. God ordains that what is useful to be done shall be done. (Applause.) When I survey the American people as they are developing themselves fully and perfectly here, I see that they are doing what the exigencies of political society throughout the world have at last rendered it necessary to be done. Society tried for six thousand years how to live and improve, and perfect itself under monarchical and aristocratic systems of government, while prac-

tising a system of depredation and slavery on each other; and the result has been all over the world, a complete and absolute failure. At last, at the close of the last century, the failure was discovered, and a revelation was made of the necessity of a system in which henceforth men should cease to enslave each other and should govern themselves. (Applause.) Nowhere in Africa, in Asia or in Europe, was there an open field where this great new work of the reorganization of a political society under more favorable forms of government could be attempted. They were all occupied. This great and unoccupied continent furnished the very theatre that was necessary, and to it come all the bold, the brave, the free men throughout the world, who feel and know that necessity, and who have the courage, the manhood and the humanity to labor to produce this great organization. Providence set apart this continent for this work, and, as I think, set apart and designated this particular locality for the place whence shall go forth continually the ever-renewing spirit which shall bring the people of all other portions of the continent up to a continual advance in the establishment of this system. I will make myself better understood by saying that, until the beginning of the present century, men had lived the involuntary subjects of political governments, and that the time had come when mankind could no longer consent to be so governed by force.

The time had come when men were to live voluntary citizens and sovereigns themselves of the States which they possessed; and that is the principle of the government established here. It has only one vital principle. All others are resolved into it. That one principle—what is it? It is the equality of every man who is a member of the State to be governed. If there be not absolute political equality, then some portion of the people are governed by force, and are not voluntary citizens; and whenever any portion of the citizens are governed by force, then you are carried so far backward again toward the old system of involuntary citizenship, or a government by kings, lords and standing army. This was the great necessity, not of the people of the United States alone. It was not even the original conception of the people of the United States that a republican government was to be established for themselves alone; but the establishment of the republican system of the United States of America was only bringing out and reducing to actual practice the ideas and opinions which men had already formed all over the civilized world; and if you will refer to the action of our forefathers you will find that while they labored, as they might well labor, to secure this government in its republican form for themselves and their posterity, yet they were conscious that they were erecting it as a model for the people of every nation, kindred and tongue under heaven. The old Continental Congress of 1787 declared that the interests of the United States were the interests of human nature, and that it was the political redemption of human nature that was to be worked out on the continent of North America, and, as I have said, it is to be brought to its perfection here in the valley of the Mississippi. Now, fellow citizens, the framers of the Republic conceived this necessity—they assumed this high responsibility. They never could have done so except for the crisis of the Revolution, which kindled enlightened patriotism within the bosoms of the people, and enabled them, for a brief period, to elevate themselves up above temporary and ephemeral interests and prejudices, and to rise to the great task of organizing and constituting a free government. The people understood the great principle on which it was to be founded—the political equality of the whole people—and that they did so understand it you will see in the Declaration of Independence, in which, beginning to lay the foundations of this great republic, they laid them on the great truth that all men are created equal, and have inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But it was not the good fortune of our forefathers to be able to find full and ample materials all of the right kind, for the erection of the temple of liberty which they constructed. Providence has so ordered it that all the materials for any edifice which the human head is required to devise and the human hand to construct cannot be found anywhere. If you propose to build a limestone house you may excavate the ground on which it is to be placed, and take from the bosom of the earth the stones, and lay them all away in their proper place in the foundation and walls. But other materials besides the limestone enter into the noblest structure that you can make. There must be some lime and some sand, and some iron, and some wood, and you must combine materials to make any human structure.

Even the founders of a great republic like this, wishing and intending to place it on the principle of the equality of man, had to take such materials as they found. They had to take a society in which some were free and some were slaves, and to form a Union in which some were free states and some were slave states. They had the ideal before them, but they were unable to perfect it all at once. What did they do? They did as the architect does who raises a structure of stone, and lime and sand; and where there is a weakness of the material, and where the strength of the edifice would be impaired, he applies braces and props, and bulwarks and battlements, to strengthen and fortify, so as to make the weak part combine with and be held together in solid connection with the firm and strong. That is what our fathers intended to do, and what they did do, when they framed the federal government. Seeing this element of slavery, which they could not eliminate, they said, "We will take care that it shall not weaken the edifice and bring it into ruin. We will take care that, although we may allow slaves now, the number of slaves hereafter shall diminish and the number of white men shall increase, and that ultimately the element of free white men shall be so strong that the element of slavery shall be inadequate to produce any serious danger, calamity or disaster." How did they do this? They did it in a simple way: by authorizing Congress to prohibit, and practically by prohibiting the African slave trade after the expiration of twenty years from the establishment of the Constitution, supposing that if no more slaves were imported the American people —then almost unanimously in favor of emancipation—would be able to eliminate from the country the small amount of slavery, which would be left to decay and decline for want of invigoration by the African slave trade. They

did another thing. They set apart the territory northwest of the Ohio river—all of the unoccupied domain of the United States—for freemen only, declaring that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude should ever enter on its soil. They did one thing more. They declared that Congress should pass uniform laws of naturalization, so that when the importation of African slaves should cease voluntary emigration of freemen from all other lands should be encouraged and stimulated. Thus, while unable to exclude slavery from the system, they provided for the development and perfection of the principle—gradually approaching it—that all men are born free and equal.

And now, fellow citizens, we see all around us the results of that wise policy. Certain of the States concurred partially in the policy of the fathers. I need not tell you what States they were. They were Massachusetts, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Some other States did not. I need not tell you what States they were. They were the six Southern States of the union. The six Southern States said: "Although the Constitution has arrested the slave trade and invited immigration, and adopted the policy of making all the men of the States free and equal, yet we will adhere to the system of slavery." Well, what is the result? You see it in the cities of Boston, New York and Philadelphia. You see it in the wheat fields of New York, of Ohio, of Indiana, of Illinois, of Wisconsin. You see it in the flocks of sheep in Vermont and New Hampshire. You see it in the cattle that multiply and abound upon a thousand hills. You see it in the millions of spindles in the manufactories of the East, and in the forges and furnaces of Pennsylvania. You see it in the crowded shipping of New York, and in her palaces and towers, ambitiously emulating the splendors of the Old World, and grasping to herself the commerce of the globe. You see even in California and Oregon the same results. You see them in the copper dug out on the banks of Lake Superior, the iron in Pennsylvania, the gypsum in New York, the salt in Ohio and New York, the lead in Illinois, and the silver and the gold in the free States of the Pacific coast. In all these you see the fruits of this policy.

Neither in forests, nor mines, nor manufactories, nor workshops, is their one African slave that turns a wheel or supplies oil to keep the machinery in motion. (Applause.) On the other hand you see millions of freemen crowding each other in a perpetual wave, rolling over from Europe on the Atlantic coast, spreading over and building up great States from the foot of the Alleghany mountains, rolling over thence year after year, until they build up in nine years a capital in Minnesota equal to the capital built in any slave State in the Union in two hundred years. (Cheers.) You see here the fruits of this great policy of the fathers; you see what comes of a wise policy. But do not let us mistake it for policy. It is not policy; it is the simple national practice of justice, of equal and exact justice to all men—for this freedom which we boast so highly, which we love so dearly, and so justly, which we prefer above every other earthly good, and without which earth is unfit for the habitation of man—what is it? Nothing but you allowing to me my rights, and I allowing to you equal rights—every man having exactly his own, the right to decide whether he will labor or perish, whether he will labor and eat, or will be idle and die—and if he will labor, for what he will labor and for whom he will labor, and the right to discharge his employer just exactly as the employer can discharge him. (Cheers.) You see the fruits of this policy in another way. Go over the American continent, from one end of it to the other, wherever the principle of equality has been retained, and every citizen of a State, and every citizen of every other State, and every exile from a foreign nation, may write, print, speak and vote—when he acquires the right to vote—just exactly as he pleases, and there is no man to molest him, no man to terrify him, no man even to complain. And now reverse the picture, and go into any State that has retained the principle of the inequality of man, and determined that it will maintain it to the last, and you will find the State where not even the native born citizen and slaveholder, or certainly none but him, can express his opinion on the question whether the African is or is not a descendant of Ham, or whether he is equal or inferior to the white man, and if he be inferior, whether it is not the duty of the white man to enslave him. No, "mum's the word" for freemen wherever slavery is retained and cherished—silence, the absence of freedom of speech and of freedom of the press. What kind of freedom is that? Is there a man in Minnesota who would for one day consent to live in it if he were not indulged in the exercise of the right to hurrah for Lincoln or to hurrah for Douglas, to hurrah for freedom or to hurrah for slavery. I think that these 180,000 people would be seen moving right out, east and west, into British North America or into Kamtschatka, anywhere on the earth, to get out of this luxuriant and fertile valley, if any power, human or divine, should declare to them that they spoke and voted their real sentiments and their real choice at their peril. Now, fellow citizens, you need only look around through such a mass of American citizens as I can see before me, and you may go over all the free States in this Union, and you will find them every day of the week somewhere gathered together, expressing their opinions, and preparing to declare their will, just exactly as you are doing. Does this *happen* to be so? Is it man's work, or device, or contrivance, that on this land, on this side of the great lakes, on this side of the Atlantic Ocean, on this side only of the Pacific Ocean, men may all meet or may all stay apart, may all speak, think, act, print, write and vote just exactly as they please, while there is no other land on the face of the earth where ten men can be assembled together to exercise the same rights without being dispersed by an armed band of soldiers? Does it *happen* to be so in the United States, or is it the result of that higher law, controlling the destinies of races and of nations of men, so as to bring out and perfect here what I have described as the great constitution of society, of a self-governing people, the practice of equal and exact justice among each other. Manifestly it is not of man's device or contrivance, but it is a superior power that

> —— "shapes our ends,
> Rough hew them how we may."

Now, fellow citizens, while we see how obviously this is the result of controlling necessity,

how obviously we read that it is in accordance with the very purpose of a beneficent Providence, how singular and strange it is that so much pains have been taken to defeat and prevent the organization and perfection of this very system of government among us. What has not the nation seen done and permitted to be done at Washington? It has permitted statutes to be made, and judgments to be rendered in its name, declaring that men are not freemen, but that in certain conditions and in certain places they are merchandise. The Supreme Court of the United States never rises without recording judgments and directing executions for the sale of men, women and children, as merchandise. And this is done in your name and mine. The Constitution never declared, never intended to declare, was never by its framers understood to declare, that any man could be a chattle and merchandise. (Applause. "Three cheers for that declaration.") All that it did declare was that all men should have rights to personal security and personal liberty within the action of the federal government. You see how we have had new religious systems established among us teaching that the African slaves among us, all Africans, are the children of an accursed parent, who was cursed not only in his own person and in his own day and generation, but in all his generations, and teaching that everybody had a right to curse his generation. We have had religious systems established among us, teaching that it is our duty to capture and return to slavery slaves escaping from their masters, because St. Paul sent back Onesimus, as they say, to his master—religious systems even teaching that it is the duty of men in a free State, not only to submit to laws passed for the purpose of extending human bondage, but even personally to execute them. You have seen in a portion of the Union how the great governing race, the white men, actually deprive themselves largely of the advantages of education and instruction for the greater security of keeping slaves in ignorance, so that schools and colleges, libraries and universities, as they are organized and perfected in the free States, and now in most of the States of Western Europe, are incapable of being had or maintained in the slave States. You have seen how we have, in order to counteract the policy of our forefathers on the subject of slavery, surrendered in 1820 the State of Missouri and all that part of the Territory of Louisiana that lies south 36° 30′ to slavery, and contented ourselves with saving to freedom what lay north of that line; and you have seen how, only forty years afterwards in order to counteract and entirely defeat the policy of the fathers in establishing such institutions as those, we surrendered and gave up the whole of what we had saved in 1820, surrendering Kansas and the whole of our possessions from one end of the continent to the other, to be made slave colonies and slave States, if slave owners could make them so, and agreeing that we would receive them into the Union, as we had already for like considerations agreed to receive four slave States out of Texas, to the end that government might not continue to be, and develop itself to be, a government founded on the equality of man, but should be and remain forever a government founded on the principle of property in man. You have seen, fellow citizens, within the last thirty years, how the Congress of the United States, in order to defeat the great policy, has suppressed for a period of nearly ten years freedom of debate and the right of petition on the subject of slavery in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States. You know now how the mails of the United States are subjected to espionage, to the end that any paper, or letter, or writing that shall argue for freedom against slavery, shall be abstracted and withdrawn, in order to fortify the power of slavery. You have seen the federal government connive and cooperate and combine with the slave party in endeavoring to force slavery on the people of Kansas when they had refused to accept it. If you have seen all these things done, I am sorry to say that most of you have, at some time in your lives, given your consent that they should be done. The American people have consented to all this action of their own government to counteract and subvert the very principles of freedom established by the constitution.

Now, since all this has been done, let us see what is the result after all—what advantage has slavery got, and what has freedom lost, while we have for forty years given our free consent that freedom should be stripped of everything and that slavery should be invested with all power. Why, they have arrested the march of emancipation at the line of Pennsylvania, and have left the ancient slavery still existing in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia; and they have added to them some five or six slave States in the southwestern angle of the Ohio and the Mississippi. That is all that they have done. And on the other hand, this great vital principle of the republic, this principle of freedom and equality, what has it not done? It has abolished slavery in seven of the original states, and has produced new and strong and most vigorous and virtuous States all along the shores of the great lakes and across to the valley of the Mississippi, and it has established freedom beyond the power of being overthrown on the coasts of the Pacific Ocean.

Certainly, since we can lay so little claim to having produced these results by our own work, or wisdom, or virtue, *what could it have been but that overruling Power, which, by its higher law, controls even the perverse wills of men, and which means that this shall be, henceforth and forever, as it was established in the beginning, a land, not of slavery, but a land of freedom.* (Cheers.) *Fellow citizens, either in one way or the other, whether you agree with me in attributing it to the interposition of Divine Providence or not, this battle has been fought, this victory has been won. Slavery to-day is, for the first time not only powerless, but without influence in the American republic.* The serried ranks of party after party, which rallied under it to sustain and support it, are broken and dissolved under the pressure of the march—the great and powerful march of the American people determined to restore freedom to its original and just position in the government. For the first time in the history of the United States, no man in a free State can be bribed to vote for slavery. The government of the United States has not the power to make good a bribe or a seduction by which to make and convert Democrats to support slavery. (Applause.) *For the first time in the history of the republic the slave power has not even the power to terrify or alarm the freeman so*

as to make him submit, and scheme, and coincide, and compromise. It rails now with a feeble voice, as it thundered in our ears for twenty or thirty years past. With a feeble and muttering voice they cry out that they will tear the Union to pieces. (Derisive laughter.) *Who's afaid?* (Laughter and cries of "No one!") They complain that if we will not surrender our principles, and our system, and our right—being a majority—to rule, and if we will not accept their system, and such rulers as they will give us, they will go out of the Union. Who's afraid? (Laughter.) *Nobody's afraid; nobody can be bought.*

Now, fellow citizens, let me ask you, since you are so prompt at answering—suppose at any time within the last forty years we could have found American people in the free States everywhere just as they are everywhere in the free States now—in such a condition that there was no party that could be bought, nobody that could be scared—how much sooner do you think this revolution would have come, in which we are now engaged? I do not believe there has been one day since 1787 until now when Slavery had any power in this government, except what it derived from buying up men of weak virtue, no principle and great cupidity, and terrifying men of weak nerve in the free States. (Laughter and applause.) And now I come to ask what has made this great political change? How is it that the American people, who, only ten years ago, said, "Take part, take all"—who only six years ago, said, "Take Kansas, carry slavery over it," who when the tears of the widows and the blood of the martyrs of liberty cried out from the ground and appealed to them for aid and help, and sympathy, said, "Let Kansas shriek;" how is it that in the space of six years you have all become— the whole people of the North and of the Northwest, the whole people of the free States—have become all at once so honest that none of them can be bought, so brave that none of them can be scared? I will tell you. Theorists and visionaries on the Atlantic coast, who of all men in the world were safest from the invasion of slavery and had least to suffer from it, while these prairies and fields and wildernesses were as yet being filled up and organized, could not be convinced of the imminence of the danger. It has been next to impossible to convince the man who lives on the sidewalk of an Atlantic city, or even the farmer in his field, who lives in Ontario, or Cayuga, or Berks, or in any of the counties of the Eastern States, that it was a matter of very great consequence to him, whether slaves or freemen constitute the people—the ruling power of the new States. But just in the right moment, when the battle was as good as lost, the emigration from the Eastern States and from the Old World, into Michigan, and Wisconsin, and Minnesota and Iowa, rose up in the exercise and enjoyment of that freedom which had been saved to them by the ordinance of 1787, and appreciating its value and importance, and feeling, every man for himself, that he neither would be a slave, nor make a slave, nor own a slave, nor allow any particular man to make or buy, or own a slave within the state to which they belonged, they came like Blucher to the rescue, and the field of Waterloo was won. The Northwest has vindicated the wisdom of the statesmen of 1787, and the virtue of the American people; and now since you were so determined that slavery should be arrested and that freedom should henceforth be national and slavery only sectional, we of the Atlantic States are becoming just as honest and just as brave as you are. (Applause.)

Fellow citizens, I must not be mis-interpreted. I have said that this battle was fought, and this victory won. I said so four years ago in the Senate of the United States, and perhaps I was thought to have thereby, instead of encouraging the great army of freedom to consummate its triumph, tended to demoralize its energies. I knew better. I knew that men worked all the better, and are all the braver when they have hope and confidence of success and triumph, instead of acting under the influence of despondency and despair. This battle is fought and this victory is won, provided that you stand determined to maintain the great Republican party under its great and glorious leader, Abraham Lincoln, in inaugurating its principles into the administration of the government, and provided you stand by him in his administration, if it shall be, as I trust it shall, a wise and just, and good one, *until the adversary shall find out that he has been beaten and shall voluntarily retire from the field.* (Applause.)

A voice—"We'll do it."

Unless you do that, there is still danger that all that has been gained may be lost. There is one danger remaining—one only. Slavery can never now force itself or be forced from the stock that exists among us, into the territories of the United States. But the cupidity of trade and the ambition of those whose interests are identified with slavery, are such that they may clandestinely and surreptitiously reopen, either within the forms of law or without them, the African slave trade, and may bring in new cargoes of African slaves at $100 a head and scatter them into the Territories; and, once getting possession of new territory, they may again operate on the cupidity or the patriotism of the American people.

Therefore it is that I enjoin upon you all to regard yourselves as men, who, although you have achieved the victory and are entitled even now, it seems, to laurels, have enlisted for the war and for your natural lives. You are committed to maintain this great policy until it shall have been so firmly reinstated in the administration of the government, and so firmly established in the hearts, and wills, and affections of the American people, that there shall never be again a demoralization from this great work. We look to you of the Northwest. Whether this is to be a land of slavery or of freedom, the people of the Northwest are to be the arbitrators of its destiny. The virtue that is to save this nation must reside in the Northwest, for the simple reason that it is not the people who live on the sidewalks, and who deal in merchandise on the Atlantic or the Pacific coasts, that exercise the power of government, of sovereignty, in the United States. The political power of the United States resides in the owners of the lands of the United States. The owners of workshops and of the banks are in the East, and the owners of the gold mines are in the far West; but the owners of the land of the United States are to be found along the shores of the Mississippi river, from New Orleans to the sources of the great rivers and the

great lakes. On both sides of this stream are the people who hold in their hands the destinies of the republic. I have been asked by many of you what I think of Minnesota. I will not enlarge further than to say that Minnesota must be either a great State or a mean one, just as her people shall have wisdom and virtue to decide.

That some great states are to be built up in the valley of the Mississippi, I know. You will no longer hear hereafter of the "Old Dominion" state; dominion has passed away from Virginia long ago. Pennsylvania is no longer the keystone of the American Union, for the arch has been extended from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific Ocean, and the center of the arch is moved westward. A new keystone is to be built in that arch. New York will cease to be the Empire State, and a new Empire State will grow up in a northern latitude, where the lands are rich, and where the people who cultivate them are all free and all equal. That state which shall be truest to the great fundamental principle of the government — that state which shall be most faithful, most vigorous in developing and perfecting society on this principle—will be at once the new Dominion State, the new Keystone State, the new Empire State. (Applause.) If there is any state in the Northwest that has been kinder to me than the State of Minnesota, and if such a consideration could influence me, then I might perhaps have a feeling of emulation for some other state. I will only say, that every man who has an honest heart and a clear head can see that these proud distinctions are within the grasp of the people of Minnesota, and every generous heart will be willing to give her a fair chance to secure them. (Loud Applause.)

The West: its Destiny and its Duty.

SPEECH

DELIVERED BY

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

AT

DUBUQUE, SEPTEMBER 21, 1860.

Fellow Citizens: He who could pass down the Mississippi, as it washes the shores of Iowa, and see the accumulated products of the harvest, waiting, under all changes of the weather, for means of transport to the eastern markets, and thence for distribution to the needy in every part of the globe, and be unmoved, must be an enemy of his race. He who could enter this, the principal seaport of the State, witness the signs of activity and thrift which appear on all sides, ascend the hills which overlook the town and river, and see the rich and useful minerals everywhere and on every side extracted from the bosom of the earth and sent abroad to perform their part in the service of mankind, must be incapable of appreciating the elements of a great and prosperous people.

I have seen, as have my fellow travelers, this exhibition; and it may be not unpleasing to you to know the results of the observations we have made. It is that, although this town and State were stimulated to a high degree of activity, and to a very rapid process of development by the great tide of capital and emigration from the east, which was arrested in the revulsion of 1857, yet the basis of the prosperity of this city and State is sure and steadfast; the blood, after such increased activity in searching the distant parts of our great system, must needs return to the heart again in the East from which it flowed. But so long as a great nation like this remains at peace, the blood is not long in filling up again the storehouse of the heart. Within a year or two or three, the prosperity of Dubuque and of Iowa will be renewed.

Fellow citizens, we were tempted by the committee who accompanied us to the heights which overlook the city, and who took us for politicians of a different class—we were tempted with the display before us. Here, they said, at your feet lie three States, Iowa, Wisconsin and Illinois—enough, they thought, to tempt ambitious politicians as they supposed us to be. I answered that the States which were desired by Northern politicians during my connection with public service, had been no such States as these which produce wheat, and corn and lead; but they were States which lay further down the valley of the Mississippi; the nearer the Gulf of Mexico the better. And my respected friend from Massachusetts remarked that they didn't seem to know what constitutes a State in the esteem of a northern politician; it is negroes that constitute the State—politicians want slaves, and you have none to offer.

Fellow citizens, we in the East are interested in your success, in your prosperity, in your aggrandizement, for we in the East are but the consumers and the manufacturers and the sellers of what you create. We should soon languish and die if production were to cease in the valley of the Mississippi. Nor, perhaps, is it necessary to add, are you independent of us, for you are charged with the responsibility of supplying the materials of men and women, and of men for the defense of the liberties of this nation and its welfare. And if we of the East are feeble and imbecile, you in the West will languish and come down to the same common ruin with ourselves. It is therefore that we propose to speak to you

on this occasion of what concerns us all; a great political question, which is to be the subject of decision by the American people in the coming canvass.

We who have come here from the East say that the national policy for the last forty years on the subject has been erroneous, false, and tends to ruin, and that it must be reversed. That policy simply, tersely stated is this: *The policy of the Federal government has been to extend and fortify African slave labor in the United States.*

Now let there be no cavil on this point, for many who have maintained the administration and the party who have carried out this policy, have been unconscious, doubtless, of the nature of the policy they maintained. But it is not a subject of dispute or cavil what has been the policy of the government of the country for forty years. I will give but one illustration. No man in the nation would have objected or could have objected to the admission of Texas into the Federal Union provided it had been a free state. No man who objected could have objected but for the reason that she was not a slave state. When the question of annexing Texas tried all the existing parties, and puzzled, bewildered, and confounded the statesmen of the country, the question was finally decided, in a short and simple way, by the declaration of the administration of John Tyler, made by Mr. Calhoun, his Secretary of State, that Texas must be annexed because it was a slaveholding country—it must be annexed with the condition of subdividing it into four slave states. Texas must be annexed for the purpose of fortifying and defending the institution of slavery in the United States. This one single fact upon which the parties joined issue, is conclusive. I will not go further in showing that that has been the policy of the country for forty years.

Now I have said that it is our proposition to reverse this policy. Our policy, stated as simply as I have stated that of our adversaries, is, *to circumscribe slavery, and to fortify and extend free labor or freedon.* Many preliminary objections are raised by those among you and us, who are not prepared to go with us to the acceptance of this issue. They say that they are tired of a hobby and of men of one idea; that the country is too great a country, and has too many interests to be occupied with one idea alone; besides that it is repulsive, offensive, it is disgusting to have "this eternal negro question" forever forced upon their consideration when they desire to think of white men and other things. It is well, perhaps, to remove these preliminary objections before we go into an argument.

Now, granting for a moment that there is wisdom in the objection to entertain this eternal negro question, pray, let us ask, who raised, who has kept up this eternal negro question?

The negro question was put at rest in 1787 by the fathers of the Republic, and it slept, leaving only for moralists and humanitarians the question of emancipation, a question within the States, and by no means a federal question. Who lifted it up from the States into the area of federal politics? Who but the slaveholders, in 1820? They demanded that not only Missouri should be admitted as a slave State, located within the Louisiana purchase; but that slavery should be declared forever and was forever without declaration of law, established and should prevail until the end of time, in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and in every foot of the then newly acquired domain of the United States? It was the slaveholding power which raised the negro question, and it was the Democratic party which made an alliance with that power, and which, in the North and in Congress, raised this very offensive question, this so very offensive legislation about negroes instead of legislation about white men.

The question was put at rest by the compromise of 1820, when, God be praised, Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska were saved for freedom, and only Arkansas and Missouri, out of the Louisiana purchase, surrendered to slavery; and it slept again for fifteen or twenty years, and then the negro question was again introduced into the councils of the Federal government—and by whom? By the slave power, when it said that "since you have taken Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska, and left us only Missouri, Arkansas and Florida, out of our newly acquired possessions, you must now go on and annex Texas, so that we shall have a balance and counterpoise in this government." Then the Democratic party again were seized with a sudden desire to extend the area of slavery along the Gulf of Mexico; and by way of balancing the triumph of liberty so as to hang manacles and chains on the claws of the conquering eagle of the country!

Who, then, is responsible for the eternal negro question? Still such was the forbearance, the patience, the hope without reason and without justice, of the friends of freedom throughout the United States, that the eternal negro question would have been at rest then, if it had not again been brought forward into the Federal councils in the years 1848 and 1850, when the slave power forced us into a war with Mexico by which we acquired Upper California and New Mexico, and for no other purpose but that, notwithstanding all the advantages which slavery had gained since the Atlantic States were free, now, as a balance, slavery must have the Pacific coast, and so keep up the equilibrium (according to the notions of Mr Calhoun) between free labor and slave labor or between freedom and slavery in the United States.

Thus, on these three different occasions, when the public mind was at rest on the subject of the negro, the slave power forced it upon public consideration and demanded aggressive action. When they had at last secured the consent of the people of the free States to a compromise in 1850, by which it was agreed that California alone might be free, and that New Mexico should be remanded back into a territorial condition because she had not established slavery—then there was but one man in the United States Senate that would vote to accept New Mexico as a Free State when she came with her constitution in her hands; and that man the humble individual who stands before you. [Cheers.] Aye, you applaud me for it now; but where were your votes in 1850? Ah! well; it is all past.

When they had agreed on a compromise, and had driven out of the Senate every man but myself and some half dozen other representatives who had opposed the aggressions of slavery, were they content to let the negro question rest? No, but in 1854 the Democracy raised the negro question to force it finally and forever throughout the whole Republic, by abrogating the Missouri Compromise. They abandoned the Terri-

tories of Kansas and Nebraska to slave labor, and actually assisted and encouraged the armies sent there by the slaveholders, to take forcible possession of territory which, until then, had been free.

O! what pleasure shall I have, in telling the people of Kansas, three days hence, how that when all others were faithless, and false, and timid, they renewed this battle, this standard of freedom, and expelled the intruding slaveholder, and established forever amongst themselves the freedom of labor and the freedom of men on the plains of Kansas.

Were the Democracy then content? Not at all; but they determined in 1858, to raise the negro question once more and to admit Kansas into the Union, if she would have come in as a Slave State, and to keep her out indefinitely if she should elect freedom.

And only one year later, when they found that Kansas was slipping from their clutches, who then raised once more the eternal negro question? The slave power and the administration took it up by demanding the annexation of Cuba, a slaveholding island of Spain, to be acquired at a cost of $150,000,000, peaceably, if it could be obtained for that sum, and forcibly if it should not be surrendered, for the purpose of adding two slave states, well manned and well appointed, to balance the votes of Kansas and Minnesota, then expected to come into the Union as free states.

Who has brought this issue and entered it on the record of this canvass? The slaveholding party—the Democratic party. They held their Convention first in this campaign at Charleston. They presented again the everlasting negro question, nothing more, nothing less. They differed about the form, but they gave us, nevertheless, the everlasting negro question in two different parts, giving us our choice to take one or the other, as they gave the people of Kansas the choice, whether they would take slavery pure and simple, or take it anyhow and get rid of it afterwards if they could.

Of one part, Mr. Breckinridge is the representative. It is presented plain and distinct; it is that slaves are merchandise and property in the territories under the Constitution of the United States, and that the national legislatures and the courts must protect it in the territories, and no power on earth can discharge them of the responsibility. Of the other, Mr. Douglas is the representative, and the form in which it is presented by those who support him is, What is the best way *not* to keep slavery out of the territories.

I doubt very much whether slaveholders have so great a repugnance to the negro and to the eternal negro question as they affect. On the other hand, being accustomed to sit in the Federal councils, with grave and reverend Senators, and to mingle with representatives of the people from slaveholding States, I find a great difference between myself and them on the subject. God knows, I never would consent to be the unbidden, the unchosen Representative of bondmen! They must be freemen that I represent; every man of them must be a whole man. But my respected friends who represent the slave States are willing, and do most cheerfully, most gladly consent to represent three-fifths of all the negro slaves. They take a slave at three-fifths of a man, and they represent the three-fifths; I doubt not they would be very glad if he could be created into five-fifths.

Well I think the Democratic party has not so much repugnance to negroes and the negro question, because they consent to take offices of President, Vice-President, Secretary of State, Ministers to Bogota, and to all other parts of the world, Consulships and post offices, that are derived indirectly by adding another link to the chain of States in which negroes count, each one, three-fifths. No, no; slaveholders and the Democratic party would be very glad to take votes from negroes, free or slave, by the head, full count, if negroes and slaves would only vote for Slavery; and it is only because they have a sagacious insight into human nature, which teaches them that negroes and slaves would vote for liberty, that makes the negro question so repulsive to them.

But, fellow citizens, is this one idea, the eternal negro question, so objectionable merely on account of the negro? I think not: I think it far otherwise; for after all, you see that the negro has the least of everybody else in the world, to do with it. The negro is no party to it; he is only an incident; he is a subject of disputes but not one of the litigants. He has just as much to do with it as a horse or a watch in a justice's court, when two neighbors are litigating about its ownership. The horse question or watch question is excellent business for the justice, and lawyers to make fees, and for the neighbors generally to get fun out of; and my friend General Nye was never so happy in his life as when attending suits before justices of the peace, settling this eternal horse question and watch question. (Laughter.)

The controversy is not with the negro at all, but with two classes of white men, one who have a monopoly of negroes, and the other who have no negroes. One is an aristocratic class, that wants to extend itself over the new territories and so retain the power it already exercises; and the other is yourselves, my good friends, men who have no negroes and won't have any, and who mean that the aristocratic system shall not be extended. There is no negro question about it at all. It is an eternal question between classes—between the few privileged and the many unprivileged—the eternal question between aristocracy and democracy.

A sorrowful world this will be when that question shall be put to rest; for when it is, the rest that it shall have, shall be the same it has always had for six thousand years; the riding of the privileged over the necks of the unprivileged, booted and spurred. And the nation that is willing to establish such an aristocracy, and is shamed out of the defense of its own rights, deserves no better fate than that which befalls the timid, the cowardly and the unworthy.

It is to-day in the United States the same question that is filling Hungary, and is lifting the throne of a Cæsar of Austria from its pedestals; the same which has expelled the tyrant of Naples from the beautiful Sicily, and has driven him from his palace at Naples to seek shelter in his fortress at Gaeta. It is not only an eternal question, but it is a universal question. Every man from a foreign land will find here in Ame-

rica, in another form, the *irrepressible conflict* (Applause) which crushed him out, an exile from his native land.

Again, fellow citizens, I am not quite convinced that it is sound philosophy in anything, at least in politics, to banish the principle of giving paramount importance at any one time to one idea. If a man wishes to secure a good crop of wheat to pay off the debt he owes upon his land, he is seized with one idea in the spring; he plows, plants and sows; he gathers and reaps, with a single leading idea of getting forty bushels to the acre, if he can. If a merchant wishes to be successful, he surrenders himself to the one idea of buying as cheap, and selling as dear as he honestly can. I would not give much for a lawyer who is put in charge of my case, that would suffer himself, when before the jury, to be distracted with a great many pleasing ideas. I want one devoted to my cause In the church we have a great many clergymen who have a horror of this one idea and the negro question, but I think it was St. Peter who had it made known to him in a vision on the housetop, that he must not have scattered ideas; but there was to be but one idea only, that was of being satisfied with everything else, provided he could only win souls to his Master. And Paul was very much after this spirit; he said he would be all things to all men, provided he could save some souls.

There was in the Revolution one man seized with a terrible fanaticism, propelled by one idea. He scattered terror all through this continent; and when he passed from Boston to the first Congress in Philadelphia, deputations from New York and Philadelphia went out to meet and dissuade this man of one idea, namely, that of national independence. And still John Adams proved, after all, to be a public benefactor. There was, during the Revolution, another man of one idea that appeared to burn in him so ardently that he was regarded as the most dangerous man on the continent; and a triple reward was offered for his head. He actually went so far as to take all the men of one idea in the country, and suffer himself to take command of them. That man was George Washington. His idea was justice, political justice. There was another monomaniac of the same kind down in Virginia; he, at the close of the Revolution, had one idea, an eternal idea, and it even included negroes; and that was the idea of equality. It was Thomas Jefferson. Now, though the State which reared him might be glad if it could erase from his monument at Monticello its sublime inscription, yet the world can never lose that proud and beautiful epitaph, written by himself: "Here lies Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence."

About the year 1805 or 1806, the French Secretary for Foreign Affairs gave a dinner to the American representative at Court, and to American citizens resident there, and there was a large and various party. When the wine flowed freely, and conversation ought to have been general, there was one young man who was possessed with one idea, and he could not rest, but kept continually putting this idea before the minister and the rest of the guests, saying, "If you will only make up for me a purse, or show me a bank that will lend me five thousand dollars, I will put a boat on the Hudson river which will make the passage from New York to Albany at four miles an hour, without being driven by oars or sails." He was an offensive monomaniac, that Robert Fulton. But still, had it not been for his one idea, Iowa would have slept the last sixty years, and down to the twentieth century, and not one human being before me or within the boundaries of this State would have resided here. What I understand by one idea is this: It simply means that a man, or a people, or a State, is in earnest. They get an idea which they think is useful, and they are in earnest. God save us when we are to abandon confidence in earnest men and take to following trivial men of light minds, confused and scattered ideas, and weak purposes.

Fellow citizens, there is no such thing as government carried out without the intervention, the rising, the exaltation of one idea, and without the activity, guidance and influence of earnest men. You may be listless, indifferent, indolent each one of you; do you therefore get other people to go to sleep? No. You go to sleep, and you will find somebody that has got one idea that you don't like, who will be wide awake. They want to be wide awake on the negro question as long as it pays, and it pays just as long as you will be content to follow their guidance and take several ideas

Fellow citizens, industry is the result of one idea. I have never heard of idle ones in the beaver's camp, but I do know there are drones in the beehive. Nevertheless, the beaver's camp and the beehive all give evidence of the domination of one idea. The Almighty Power himself could never have made the world, and never govern it, if he had not bent the force and application of the one idea to make it perfect. And when at 7 o'clock in the morning, three months ago, with the almanac in my hand, I stood with my smoked glass between me and the sun to see whether the almanac maker was correct or whether nature vascillated between one idea and another, I was astonished to see that, at the very second of time indicated by the astronomer, the shadow of the moon entered the disk of the sun. There was one idea only in the mind of the Omnipotent Creator that, six thousand, or ten thousand, or twenty thousand, or hundreds of thousands of years ago, set that sun, that moon, and this earth in their places, and subjected them to laws which brought that shadow exactly at this point at that instant of time. Earth is serious; heaven is serious; earth is earnest; heaven is earnest. There is no place for men of scattered and confused ideas in the earth below, or in the heavens above, whatever there may be in places under the earth.

Every one idea has its negative. It has its destinies, its purpose, and it has its negative. So it is with the idea of slavery; it means nothing less, nothing more, nothing different from the extension of commerce or trading in slaves; and in our national system it means the extension of commerce in slaves into regions where that commerce has no right to exist. The negative of that is our right which we are endeavoring to inculcate in your minds, opposition to trading in slaves within those portions of the Territory where slaves are not lawfully a subject of merchandise.

At the time of the compromise of 1820 the Democratic party saw, for they are wise men, and their opponents, Rufus King, John W. Taylor and others in Congress, saw, that there was

an irrepressible conflict between the two ideas of slavery and freedom, or rather between the two sides of one idea. The alternative offered to the Democracy and to all the people of the United States, was a plain one; the slaveholders are strong, are united; there are many slave States and they are agreed in their policy; there are as many free States, but they are divided in opinion. Lend your support to the slave States and you shall have the power, patronage, honors and glory of administering the government of the United States. Some asked, for how long? Wise men cast the horoscope and said forty years; just about that time an infant State shall grow up north of Missouri within the Louisiana purchase, and another shall grow up in Kansas. These forty years the great men I have named seemed few and feeble in numbers; still they would rather have quiet consciences during all the time and postpone honors and rewards for forty years, rather than to take the side of slavery; and the Democratic party reasoning otherwise, said, "Give us the offices and power now; we will hold it the forty years and more if we can."

They say that the "old one" is inexorable; that when he makes a bond he lives up to it, but when the time is up he calls for his own. To Mr. Breckinridge, Mr. Douglas, slave States and all, he says: "I have given you all the rope that was allowed me to give you, now you must go."

This, my young friends, for I see many such around me, brings me to a point where I can give you one instruction which, if you practice as long as you live, may make at least some of you great men, honorable men, useful men. Remember that all questions have two sides; one is the right side, and the other the wrong side; one is the side of justice, the other that of injustice; one the side of human nature, the other of crime. If you take the right side, the just side, ultimately men, however much they may oppose you and revile you, will come to your support; earth with all its powers will work with you and for you, and Heaven is pledged to conduct you to complete success. If you take the other side, there is no power in earth or heaven that can lead you through successfully, because it is appointed in the councils of heaven that justice, truth and reason alone can prevail. This instruction would be incomplete if I were not to add one other, that indifference between right and wrong is nothing else than taking the wrong side. The policy of a great leader of the Democratic party in the North is indifference; it is nothing to him whether slavery is voted up or voted down in the Territories. Thus it makes no difference to that distinguished statesman whether slavery is voted up or voted down in the new States; whether they all become slave States or free States.

Let us see how this would have worked in the revolution. If Jefferson had been indifferent as to whether Congress voted up the Declaration of Independence or voted it down, what kind of a time would they have had with it. Patrick Henry would have been after him with a vigilance committee, and he would have no monument over his remains. The British Government would have liked nothing better than a lot of such indifferent men for leaders of the American people, and George the Third and his dynasty might have had rule over this continent for a thousand years to come.

I have thus removed the preliminary objection always interposed on these occasions against the indulgence of the eternal negro question. What is the just and right national policy with regard to slavery in the territories and in the new States of the Federal Union? and your decision of that subject will involve the consideration of what you consider to be the natural constituents of a state.

I suppose I may infer from your choosing this beautiful land on the western bank of the Mississippi that you all want to make Iowa a great and good state, a flourishing and prosperous state. You consider the development of the latent resources with which nature has supplied the region on which you build a state, as one of the material things to be considered in building up a great state; that is to say, you will have the forests subjugated and make them contribute the timber and lumber for the house, for the city, for the wharf, for the steamer, for the ship of war, and for all the purposes of civilized society. Then I think you will consider that if the land has concealed within it, deposits of iron, or lead, or coal, you will think of getting this out as rapidly as you can, so as to increase the public wealth. Then I think that you will have the same idea about states everywhere else that you have about Iowa; and that your first idea about the way to make a state corresponds with my idea to make a great nation. And as you would subdue the forests, would develop the lead, iron and coal in your region; as you would improve the fields, putting ten oxen to a plow to turn up the prairie, and then plant it with wheat and corn; as you would encourage manufactures, and try, by making railways and telegraphs, to facilitate interchange of products; it is exactly this I propose to do for every new state like Iowa, that is to be admitted into the Federal Union. To be sure we shall leave the slave states, which are all in the Union, as they are; our responsibilities are limited to the states which are yet to come into the Union, and we will apply our system to them. The first question, then, in making a state, is to favor the industry of the people, and industry is favored in every land exactly as it is free and uncrippled.

We are a great nation; we have illimitable forests in the far East and on the banks of the upper waters of the Mississippi, around the lakes and on the Pacific coast. No human arithmetic could compute the amount of materials of the forest that have gone into the aggregate of the wealth which this nation possesses. At this day there is not one foot of timber, not one foot of dealboards, not a lath, not a shingle, entering into the commerce of the United States that is fabricated by a slave.

You all have an idea, or had in the land from which you came here, of the value and importance of the fisheries, of making the ocean surrender its treasures to increase the national wealth. The fisherman is seen in the winter time fishing for ice in the ponds and lakes of Massachusetts; and if you go to Palestine or to Grand Cairo or to the furthest Indies, you will find yourself regaled with ice fished out of the lakes and ponds of Massachusetts. But ice is not a product that goes far to the support of human life;

but can you tell me what portions of the earth are lighted on their way by night, at home in their cities, by the produce of their fisheries? Have you any idea of how much the great machinery of the country engaged in fabrication of goods and in navigation is indebted to the fisheries? Those of the United States are a great source of national wealth; and a nursery of seamen for the commercial marine and naval service of the United States, indispensable for the development of the resources of a great people. There is not now and there never was a lake or river, sea or bay, over the whole world, from the Arctic to the Antarctic pole, a negro slave fisherman.

You have been very indifferent about these subjects; you have not taken notice of that. It was only two years ago, only by constant watchfulness and activity of the friendly representatives of the free States in Congress, that the whole protection of the United States was not withdrawn from the fisheries. The slaveholders don't want ice to be gathered with free soil hands; they would rather have it taken from the lakes and rivers of Russia. They don't want the fisheries conducted by free hands; they would rather take their supplies from foreign markets. The fisheries are somewhat foreign for you, but the quarries are not—the granite and the marble out of which our capitol is being constructed, our great cities erected, some of it in your own beautiful city. Have you any idea of how large a portion of the national wealth is extracted from the quarries of granite and marble, and freestone? It is beyond any arithmetic to compute. Yet there is not a slave engaged in a quarry in the United States. Have you any slaves down your shafts in your lead mine here? Not one. Have you any slaves in your coal mines? Not one. Any in your iron mines? Not one. Pennsylvania is being burrowed all through and through in all directions, and the iron and coal taken out and fabricated. There is not a single slave, nor was there ever one, that raised his hand to add to that supply of national wealth. On the other hand, you have in Maryland and in Virginia deposits of coal and iron, as rich, aye, and of gold, too; and yet in Maryland and Virginia, in their iron, coal, and silver mines, the work is mainly done by freemen.

I need not speak of manufactures; the African slave is reduced to a brute, as nearly as may be, and he is incompetent to weave, to cast a shuttle, to turn a wheel, to grease or oil a wheel and keep it in motion. In all the vast manufacturing establishments in the United States; in all the establishments of the forests and of the fisheries, or of manufactures throughout the whole world, there is not one African slave to be found. California rejected the labor of slaves, and well she did so; for if she had invited and courted it, her mines, instead of yielding fifty millions of gold per year to the commerce of the United States, would be yielding nothing.

Could a man subsist in Iowa by cultivating wheat or corn with slave labor? If not, they tell us this is a question altogether of economy, and that men have no idea of justice. No man has ever brought or ever thinks of bringing an African slave here; the reason is a moral one; that slave labor don't pay, and only free labor will.

Commerce is of two kinds, domestic and foreign. The commerce down the Mississippi and up, commerce across the railroads with New York, is domestic commerce; the commerce across the ocean with foreign nations, is the foreign commerce. In New Orleans I found that sixteen thousand men were engaged in domestic trading on the river between New Orleans and the up country in the Mississippi valley. How many of them were slaves? Not one. Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, New York, Michigan, send the boatmen who conduct the commerce even in slave States, while on all the oceans there is not a slave engaged in commerce.

Now the three great wheels of national wealth are agriculture, including the subjugation of the forests, manufactures and trade. Slaves are unfit, African slaves are absolutely unfit to be employed in turning either of those wheels; and it thus enters into the elements of a great and prosperous state that its people shall not be slaves but freemen.

The reason is obvious; it is the interest of the freeman to cultivate himself as well as he can, to produce the most he can, at the least cost; and it is the interest of the slave to be as disqualified as he can, to consume as much as he can, and produce as little more than he consumes as possible.

It is not wealth alone that makes a nation. It must have strength and power to command, by the mere signification of its will, peace and good order at home and respect and confidence abroad. Just imagine the United States converted into planting States in which the labor was performed only by negro slaves, and judge, if you can, what would be the police power of the government in any of the States. The laborer in a slave State is watched night and morning; his outgoings, his incomings, his path is surrounded by a police; he can pass to execute the order of his master only on a permit or license. Why, he must retire to sleep at nine or ten at night, and must not be abroad from the plantation without a special license, for no other reason than, being held in involuntary bondage, his master regards him as an enemy to be watched.

Turn a whole nation into masters watching slaves, and slaves regarded as natural enemies—what is the power of that nation to preserve peace at home? What its power to command respect abroad? Make us for once a nation of slave States, and any feeble, worthless power in Europe has only to apply the torch of insurrection and civil war by proposing to emancipate our slaves; instead of relying on ourselves we would want to make a federal union with Canada, that we might get protection, just as the free States now protect the slave States.

But all these—material wealth and power—are but low ideas of what constitute a nation. It should have a head, an enlightened head; an open, free, manly, honest heart. Such will enable any man or woman to go through the world with safety. A nation is only an aggregate of individuals, of so many heads to work as one head; of so many hearts to work as one heart. You want an enlightened free people to constitute a nation; and if you have such a people, they are perpetually reducing the labor, the sacrifice, and toil of muscle; and if it be true, as theologians say, that labor is the primal curse imposed by the Maker on man for disobedience, then this benevolent heart and enlightened head will suggest all manner of machines to relieve

them of the necessity of so much labor. The poor widow, who, to eke out a subsistence, has to sew for her neighbors, will, with a machine that costs but from fifty to one hundred dollars —the invention of a free people—make fifty garments where before she made but one. And the steam engine—it plows, plants, sows and harvests; it threshes, it gathers into the granaries; it hauls the cars loaded with produce; it drives the steamboat on the river. That is what invention does. Now, out of the million inventions which the American people enjoy, there is not one that was made by a slave, and simply because the slave is imbruted in his heart and stupified in his intellect.

A nation to be great wants character—character for justice, honesty, integrity; for ability to maintain its own rights and respect for the rights of others. That it cannot have, if it be a nation of slaves. It is only a nation of freemen that can cultivate the virtues which constitute a character. These virtues are two: Justice, equal and exact justice among men; the equal freedom and liberty of every other man. The other virtue is courage. The freeman has no enemies; he is just; he oppresses nobody; nobody wishes to be revenged upon him. A nation of freemen are safe; they provoke nobody; they wrong nobody; they covet nothing; they keep the tenth commandment. And nations must keep the commandments as well as individuals, or suffer the same penalty.

But you cannot have these virtues except on one condition, and that is that the people of the nation are trained up in them. And how trained? By schools and general instruction, free press, free debate at home, and in legislative councils; and everywhere to be undisturbed as they go in and come out. Introduce slavery in Iowa, and what kind of freedom of speech would you enjoy? What kind of freedom of the press? freedom of bridges? of taverns? Just look across the State of Missouri into Kansas, and you will find freedom of the press, provided you will maintain that property is above labor, that slavery is before all constitutions and governments—that freedom of speech which sought the expulsion of John Quincy Adams from the Congress of the United States, for presenting a petition in favor of human rights; the freedom of debate which arrested my distinguished and esteemed friend, Charles Sumner, in the midst of a glorious and useful career, and doomed him to wander a sufferer and invalid for four years. As for freedom of bridges, why the bridge over the Missouri at Kansas was proved to be only a bridge for slave State men; and the tavern at Lawrence was subverted for a nuisance on account of its being a tavern at which free State men could stop.

It is a bright September afternoon, and a strange feeling of surprise comes over me that I should be here in the State of Iowa—the State redeemed and saved in the compromise of 1820—a State peopled by freemen—that I should be here in such a State, before such a people, imploring the citizens of Iowa to maintain the cause of Freedom instead of the cause of Slavery. It is a strange change from the position I was in only a year ago. In Italy, in Austria, in Turkey even, I was excusing, in the best way I could, the monstrous delinquencies of the American people in tolerating slavery, which even the Turk had abrogated. You tell me that it is unnecessary; that you are all right; I happen to know better. That courtesy which I appreciate, suavity which I acknowledge, restricts some, many in this assembly from interrupting these remarks (though they are intended to be disrespectful to nobody) as I have often been interrupted, with shouts of—"Hurrah for Douglas;" and yet, if I am right in what I have said, the Wide-Awakes are not up an hour too soon; they do not sit up any too late o' nights; their zeal is not a bit too strong to save the State of Iowa from giving her votes, in the present canvass, for a continuance of that administration which has for forty years, made slavery the cardinal institution, and freedom secondary to it in the United States. There is something of excuse and apology for this; it is in the reluctance which men who are always opposed to one new idea coming in, have to give up the old idea, which they have so long cherished. The Democratic party has a wonderful affection for the name; the *prestige* of the Democratic party; and most of them, fellow citizens, must die unconverted. It is not in human nature that adult men and women change their opinions with facility; it is little ones like these that grow up unobserved and unknown. Ten thousand of their votes enter into every successive canvass in the State of Iowa.

In every State the great reformation which has been made within the last six years—for we date no further back than that—has been the dying out of the one-idea men of Democracy and the growing up of the young one-idea men of Republicanism. And now why shall we not insist, so far as our votes shall be effective, that the territories shall remain free territories, so that new States which shall hereafter be added to this Union shall be Free States.

They say we have no right to interfere in the slave States; that we attack slavery in them. Not at all. We do not vote against slavery in Virginia. We do not authorize Abraham Lincoln or the Congress of the United States to pass any laws about slavery in Virginia. We merely authorize them to intervene in the Territories, and to pass laws securing freedom there. They tell us that it is unnecessary. They have rendered it necessary, because they have explained the laws and the constitution to establish slavery there, and we must either restrict slavery there or reverse the decision made by the federal tribunal. But they tell us that this is inconvenient; it excites violence in the slave States. To which I answer that they have the choice between slavery and freedom as well as we; but they must be content to leave it where it is. When they choose to carry slaves into the Territories we interfere. What we are attacking is not slavery in the United States, but slavery in the Territories.

But they tell us that we are suffering very great harm; that our Southern friends, driven angry, will not buy of us. Mayor Wood made the discovery that we are a trading people, and we shall lose our trade if the Republican party come into power. We are a trading people as we are an eating people, a drinking people, a clothes wearing people. Trade! trade! trade! the great character, the great employment, the one idea of the American people! It is a libel. We buy only with what we produce. We buy

and sell, but that is merely incidental to our greater occupation of producing and making; and even these are subordinate to our great notion of educating and cultivating ourselves to make a great, virtuous and happy people. Trade, however, for those who engage in it, knows no respect of opinion; the southern planters will buy their cotton bagging of the men who will make it the cheapest, and they will insist on selling cotton to the Castle Garden committees and the Cooper Institute patriots at precisely the same price as they will to Wendell Phillips and Frederick Douglas. They wont buy your wheat unless hungry for bread; and if hungry for bread they will gladly give you for it any surplus of cotton you want. (Laughter.)

Fellow citizens, I have refrained from adverting to the higher sentiments of humanity which enter into the consideration of this subject, because those are considerations that are always with you. I will now say that the suggestions of justice are always in harmony with the suggestions and impulses of humanity, and that both spring from the same source. Nature herself seems to be forbearing; she seems to be passive and silent. She lets nations as she lets individuals go on in their course of action, violating her laws; but this is for a season only. The time comes at last when Nature unerringly vindicates every right, and punishes every wrong, of the actions of men or states; and when she does come we are punished. She comes in terror, in revolution, in anarchy, in chaos. You will let this government and this nation slide down still further the smooth declivity if you choose; nature will bring it back again in due time with convulsions which will wake the sighs and groans of the civilized world. (Loud applause.)

GOVERNOR SEWARD'S

REMARKS ON HIS RECEPTION AT MADISON,

September 11, 1860.

The reception of Gov. Seward here was more imposing than at any place on the route. Three Military Companies, the Fire Department, the Turners and the Wide-Awakes, escorted him into the city.

He was welcomed by the Governor and the Mayor. His reply was brief, and characterized by deep feeling. In the course of it, he said:

It has been by a simple rule of interpretation I have studied the Constitution of my country. That rule has been simply this: That by no word, no act, no combination into which I might enter, should any one human being of all the generations to which I belong, much less any class of human beings of any nation, race, or kindred, be oppressed and kept down in the least degree in their efforts to rise to a higher state of liberty and happiness. [Applause.] Amid all the glosses of the times, amid all the essays and discussions to which the Constitution of the United States has been subjected, this has been the simple, plain, broad light in which I have read every article and every section of that great instrument. Whenever it requires of me that this hand shall keep down the humblest of the human race, then I will lay down power, place, position, fame, everything rather than adopt such a construction of such a rule. [Applause] If, therefore, in this land there are any who would rise, I say to them, in God's name, good speed! If there are in foreign lands people who would improve their condition by emigration, or if there be any here who would go abroad in search of happiness, in the improvement of their condition, or in their elevation toward a higher state of dignity and happiness, they have always had, and they always shall have, a cheering word and such efforts as I can consistently make in their behalf. [Applause.]

Senator Seward's Western Tour.

SPEECH

BY

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

AT

CHICAGO, OCTOBER 3, 1860.

Hail to the State of Illinois! whose iron roads form the spinal column of that system of internal continental trade which surpasses all the foreign commerce of the country, and has no parallel or imitation in any other country on the face of the globe.

Hail Chicago! the heart which supplies life to this great system of railroads—Chicago, the last and most wonderful of all the marvelous creations of civilization in North America.

Hail to this council chamber of the great Republican party! justly adapted by its vastness and its simplicity to its great purposes—the hall where the representatives of freemen framed that creed of Republican faith, which carries healing for the relief of a disordered nation. Woe! woe! be to him who shall add to or shall subtract one word from that simple, sublime, truthful, beneficent creed.

Hail to the Representatives of the Republican party, chosen here by the Republicans of the United States, and placed upon the platform of that creed. Happy shall he be who shall give them his suffrage. If he be an old man, he shall show the virtue of wisdom acquired by experience; if he be a young man, he shall in all his coming years, tell his fellow men with pride, "I too voted for Abraham Lincoln." [Great applause.]

Fellow citizens, that Republican creed is, nevertheless, no partisan creed. It is a National faith, because it is the embodiment of the one life-sustaining, life-expanding idea of the American republic. What is the idea more or less than simply this: That civilization is to be maintained and carried on upon this continent by Federal States, based upon the principles of free soil, free labor, free speech, equal rights and universal suffrage? [Loud applause.]

Fellow citizens, this is no new idea. This idea had its first utterance, and the boldest and clearest of all the utterances it has ever received, in the very few words that were spoken by this nation when it came before the world, took its place upon the stage of human action, and asserting its independence in the fear of God, and in full confidence of the approval of mankind; declared that henceforth it held those to be its enemies, who should oppose it in war, and those to be its friends who should maintain with it relations of peace. That utterance was expressed in these simple words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal, and have inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This great national idea has been working out its fruits ever since. Its work is seen in the perfect acceptance of it by eighteen of the thirty-four States of the Union —or seventeen of the thirty-three, if Kansas is to be considered out. It is asserting itself in the establishment of new States throughout the West, as it has revolutionized and is revolutionizing all of Western and Southern Europe. Why is this idea so effective? It is because it is the one chief, living, burning, inextinguishable thought of human nature itself, entertained by man in every age and in every clime.

Fellow citizens, this national idea works not unopposed. Every good and virtuous and benevolent principle in nature has its antagonist, and this great national idea works in perpetual opposition—I may be allowed to say in irrepressible conflict—[Prolonged applause]—with an erroneous, a deceitful, a delusive idea. Do you ask what that delusive idea is? It is the idea that civilization ought and can be effected on this continent, through this form of federal States, based on the principle of slave labor—of African slave labor, of unequal rights and unequal representation, resulting in unequal suffrage.

[Here there was much tumult and confusion,

owing to efforts of those beyond the reach of his voice to hear, drowning the speaker's voice.]

Fellow citizens: Can it be that this great creed of ours needs exposition or defense? It seems to me so evidently just and true that it requires no exposition and needs no defense. Certainly in foreign countries it needs none. In Scotland, or France, or Germany, or Russia, on the shores of the Mediterranean, in Europe, or in Asia, or in Africa, you will never find one human being who denies the truth and the justice of this national idea of the equality of man.

[Here the tumult became so great that the speaker was compelled to pause. Mr. Arnold coming forward, urged upon all to be as quiet as possible. Those who were out of reach of Mr. Seward's voice, and desired to hear other speakers, could do so at the various stands and at the Wigwam. He thought it must be very painful to the distinguished speaker to witness such a disturbance.]

Gov. Seward: Fellow citizens, do not suppose that this disturbance, which I know is involuntary on your part, gives me any pain whatever. [Applause.] There is no pressure here which an honest man need regret. I only regret that I have not voice enough to reach the whole of this vast assembly, or even the twentieth part of it. I will proceed, trusting that something I may say will reach the ears of most of the assemblage. As necessarily I must change my position as I speak to make you hear me, addressing first this side and then that, no one will, I fear, be able to preserve the connection of my remarks, except myself—and he is a very fortunate speaker who does that. [Laughter.]

I was speaking of this national idea—that it needs no exposition anywhere. It is one of those propositions that when addressed to thoughtful men needs no explanation or defense. And why not?

Here we can see for ourselves this mean and miserable rivulet of black African slavery, stealing along turbid and muddy as it is drawn from its stagnant source in the slave States; we see that it is pestilential in the atmosphere it passes through; we can see how inadequate it is and unfit to irrigate a whole continent with the living waters of health and life; we can see how it is that everything on its banks withers and droops; while on the other hand, we can also see this broad flood of free labor as it descends the mountain sides in torrents, and is gathered in rivers, increasing in volume and power, and spreading itself all abroad. We can well see by the effects it has already produced, how it irrigates and must continue to irrigate this whole continent; how every good and virtuous plant lives and breathes by its support. We see the magical fertility which results from its presence, because it is around us and before us always.

We sometimes, fellow citizens, hear an argument for a political proposition made in this form: One offers to "take a thing to be done by the job." Let us imagine for a moment that there could be one man bold enough, great enough, and wise enough to take "by the job" the work of establishing civilization over this broad continent of North America. He would, of course, want to do it in the shortest time, at the cheapest expense, and in the best manner. Now, would such a man ever dream of importing African barbarians; or of taking their children or descendants in this country to build up and people great Free States all over this land, from the Alleghany Mountains to the Pacific Ocean? Would he not, on the contrary, accept, as the rightful, natural, healthful, and best possible agency which he could select, the free labor of free men, the minds, the thoughts, the wills, the purposes, the ambitions of enlightened freemen, such as we claim ourselves to be? would he not receive all who claim to aid in such services as these whether they were born on this soil, or cradled in foreign lands?

I care not, fellow citizens, when reckless men say in the heat of debate, or under the influence of interest, passion or prejudice, that it is a matter of indifference whether slavery shall pervade the whole land, or a part of the land, and freedom the residue—that freedom and slavery may take their chances—that they "don't care whether slavery is voted up or down." There is no man who has an enlightened conscience who is indifferent on the subject of human bondage. [Applause.] There is no man who is enlightened and honest, who would not abate some considerable part of his worldly wealth, if he could thereby convert this land from a land cursed in whole or in part with slavery, into a land of equal and impartial liberty [cheers]; and I will tell you how I know this: I know it, because every man demands freedom for himself, and refuses to be a slave. No free man, who is a man, would consent to be a slave; every slave who has any manhood in him, desires to be free; no man who has an unperverted reason does not lament, condemn and deplore the practice of commerce in man. The executioner is always odious, even though his task is necessary to the administration of justice. We turn with horror and disgust from him who wields the axe. So the slaveholder turns with disgust from the auctioneer who sells the man and woman whom he has reared and held in slavery, although he receives the profits of the sale into his own coffers.

I know this national idea of ours is just and right for another reason; it is that in the whole history of society, human nature has never, never honored one man who reduced another man to bondage. The world is full of monuments in honor of men who have delivered their fellow men from slavery.

Since this idea is self-evidently just, and is of itself pure, peaceable, easy to be entreated and full of good works, will you tell me why it is that it has not been fully accepted by the American people? Alas! that it should be so. Perhaps I can throw light on that by asking another question: Is not Christianity pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, and full of good works? and yet is not the church of Jesus Christ still a church militant? Alas! that it should be so. Christianity explains for herself how it is that she is rejected of men. She says it is because men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. I shall not say this in regard to the subject of freedom. I know better; I know that my countrymen love light—not darkness. They are even in the state and disposition of the Roman Governor, "almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," and almost the American people are persuaded to be Republican. [Cheers and laughter.] Why, then

are they not *altogether* persuaded? The answer cannot be given without some reflection. It involves an examination of our national conduct and life.

The reason why the country is only almost and not altogether persuaded to be Republican, is because the national sense and judgment have been perverted. We inherited slavery; it is organized into our national life—into our forms of government. It exists among us, unsuspected in its evils, because we have become accustomed, through national habit, to endure and tolerate slavery. The effect of this habit arising from the presence of slavery, is to produce a want of moral courage among the people and an indisposition to entertain and examine the subject. It is not, however, the fault of the people. This lack of moral courage is chiefly the fault of the political representatives of the people. In every district in the United States, and for every seat in Congress, the people might select men apparently as brave, as truthful, as fearless and as firm as Owen Lovejoy. [Applause.]

You may fill the halls of Congress with men from all the Free States who seem to be as reliable as Owen Lovejoy; but on the clangor of the slavery bugle in the hall they begin to waver and fail. They retire. They suffer themselves to be demoralized; and they return to demoralize the people. Slavery never hesitates to raise the clangor of the trumpets to terrify the timid.

Slavery has, too, another argument for the timid than terror; it is power. The concentration of Slavery gives it a fearful political power. You know how long it has been the controlling power in the Executive Department of the Government. Slavery uses that power, as might be expected—to punish those who oppose it, to reward those who serve it. All representatives are naturally ambitious; all representatives like fame; if they do not like pecuniary rewards, they like the distinctions of place. They like to be popular. When the people are demoralized, he who is constant becomes offensive and obnoxious; he loses position and the party chooses some other representative who will be less obnoxious. These demoralized representatives inculcate among the people pernicious lessons and sustain themselves by adopting compromises. They compromise so far, if possible, as to save place and a show of principle; they save themselves first, and let freedom take what remains.

A community thus demoralized by its representatives is fearful of considering the subject of Slavery at all. It does not like to look back upon its record; it does not dare to look forward to see what are to be the consequences of errors. It desires peace and quiet. We shall see in a moment what fearful sacrifices have beeen made under the influence of this demoralization by the power of the government.

The first act of demoralization was to surrender the Territory of Arkansas and the Territory of Missouri to slavery, and also by implication all the rest of the Territory of Louisiana acquired by purchase from France, that lay south of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes north latitude. Take up your maps when you go home, and see what a broad belt of country, lying south of that line, was surrendered, with the States of Missouri and Arkansas, to slavery. Next, under the influence of this same demoralization, the whole of the peninsula of Florida, acquired from Spain, was surrendered to slavery, rendering it practically useless for all the national purposes for which it was acquired, making it a burden instead of a blessing, a danger instead of a national safeguard in the Gulf of Mexico.

Then Texas was surrendered to slavery and brought in with the gratuitous agreement that four slave States should be made out of that Territory. Next, in 1850, Utah and New Mexico were abandoned to slavery. After these events, following in quick succession, came the abrogation, in the year 1854, of the restriction contained in the Missouri Compromise, by which it had been stipulated that all north of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes, excepting the State of Missouri, should be dedicated to freedom. That was abandoned to slavery to take it if she could get it; and the administration of the government of the United States, with scarcely a protest from the people, went on to favor its occupancy by Slavery. As a legitimate consequence came the refusal, on the part of the national government—for it was a practical refusal—to admit Kansas into the Union because she would not accept slavery.

After this demoralization had been carried out in these measures, what right had the nation to be surprised when the President and the Supreme Court at last pronounced that which in no previous year either of them would have dared to assert—that this Constitution of ours is not a Constitution of Liberty, but that it is a Constitution of human bondage; that slavery is the normal condition of the American people on each acre of the domain of the United States not organized into States—that is to say, that wherever this banner of ours, this star spangled banner, whose glories we celebrate so highly—wherever this banner floats over a national ship or a national Territory, there is a land, not of freedom, but of slavery!

Hence it has followed, that the nation up to 1854 surrendered all the unoccupied portions of this continent to Slavery, and thereby practically excluded freemen — because experience shows that when you have made a slave Territory, freedom avoids it; just as much as when you make a free State, like Kansas, slavery disappears from it

I have said that the country was demoralized by its political representatives; but these political representatives have their agents. All men necessarily fall into some political party, and into some political parties and religious sects. To gain office in a political party and share its favors, when the nation was demoralized, it became necessary that the candidate should be tolerant of slavery. So religious sects were ambitious to extend their ecclesiastical sway. The consequence was that year by year slavery had party upon party; slavery had religious sect upon religious sect; church after church. But alas! until the dawn of that year freedom had no party and no religious sect throughout this whole country.

A people who are demoralized are easily operated upon; they are easily kept persistently in the same erroneous habit which has demoralized them. The first agency for continunig to extend the power of slavery upon this continent, is that of alarm. Fears of all kinds are awakened in the public mind. The chief of them is the fear

of turbulence, of disorder, of civil commotions, and of civil war. The slaveholders in the Slave States very justly, and truthfully, and rightfully assume that slaves are the natural enemies of their masters; and, of course, that slaves are insidious enemies of the State which holds them, or requires them to be held in bondage; that insidious enemies are dangerous; and, therefore, in every Slave State that has ever been founded in this country, a policy is established which suppresses freedom of speech and freedom of debate, so far as liberty needs advocates, while it extends the largest license of debate to those who advocate the interests of Slavery. This lack of freedom of speech and freedom of debate is followed in Slave States by the necessary consequence, that there is no freedom of suffrage. So that at the last Presidential election—the first when this question was ever distinctly brought before the American people—there were no Slave States in which a ballot-box was open for freedom, or wherein free men might cast their ballots with safety. If one side only is allowed to vote in a State, it is very easy to see that that side must prevail. [Laughter and applause.]

If the condition of civil society is such that voting is not to be done safely, few men will vote. Every man who wishes to express his choice is not expected to be a martyr. The world produces but few men willing to be martyrs, my friends, and I am sorry to say they have not been very numerous in our day. Nearly one-half of the United States, then—that is, all the Slave States, are at once to be arrayed on the side of slavery; and behold then! they tell us that Republicanism, which invites them to discuss the subject, is sectional, and they are national. But the Slave States are not willing to rest content with this exclusion of all freedom of suffrage, of speech and of debate on the subject of Slavery within their own jurisdiction, but they require the free States to accept the same system for themselves. They insist that although they may be able at home to keep down their slaves, if we will be quiet, yet they cannot tolerate a discussion of Slavery in the Free States, as we thereby encourage the slaves in the Slave States to insurrection and sedition. This argument might fail to reach and convince us, inasmuch as we, ourselves, are safe from any danger of insurrection in the Slave States.

But they bring it home to our fears by declaring that their peace is of more importance than the interest of the nation; that they prefer Slavery even to Union; that if we will not acquiesce in allowing them to maintain, fortify and extend Slavery on equal terms, then they will dissolve the Union, and we will all go down together, or we will all suffer a common desolation. There are few men—and there ought to be few—who would be so intent on the subject of establishing Freedom that they would consent to a subversion of the Union to produce it, because the Union is a positive benefit, nay, an absolute necessity, and to save the Union, men may naturally dare to delay. Most men, therefore, very cheerfully prefer to let the subject of Slavery rest for some better time—for some better occasion—for some more fortunate circumstances, and they are content to keep the Union with Slavery if it cannot be kept otherwise.

You see how this has worked in demoralizing the American people. Less than thirty years ago the Governor of Massachusetts—that first and freest of the States—actually recommended the Legislature to pass laws which would declare that the meetings of citizens held to discuss the subject of Slavery should be deemed seditious, and should be dissolved by the police! The Governor of the State of New York, who preceded me in that high office, during his administration, and within your own lifetime and mine, actually made the same recommendation to the Legislature of that State. What was recommended, but not carried out in those States by law, became a custom and practice; for, as you know, when the laws did not dissolve the public assembly, there was a period of near twenty years in which no public meeting of men opposed to the extension or aggrandizement of Slavery, could be held without being dispersed by the mob, acting in concert with the general opinion of the country.

When the people of the Free States were thus demoralized, what wonder is it, that for twelve years all debates on the subject of slavery or the presentation of the subject by the people even in the form of a petition, was repressed and trampled under foot, and remained there until John Quincy Adams at last rallied a party around him, strong enough to restore freedom of debate in the House of Representatives! What wonder is it that within the last year, in the very face of the organization, and the onward march of the Republican party, the administration of the Federal Government has actually, by its officers, appointed in compliance with the dictation of the slaveholders, abandoned the Federal mails to the inspection and surveillance of the magistrates of the slave States; so that they may abstract and commit to the flames every word that any man may speak, however eloquent, able, truthful or moderate, in the Halls of Congress against slavery and in favor of freedom.

This, fellow citizens, is your Government. This is the condition in which you are placed. I am sorry to say—but I like to be truthful—that I have no especial compliments for you of the State of Illinois, on this subject; for in this long catalogue of extraordinary concessions to slavery, under the impulse of fear, I think the very first protest that ever came from the State of Illinois was as late as the year 1855; after all these atrocious concessions had been made, and we were brought to the necessity of going back and undoing mischief that had been done. You sent two senators to Congress; you insisted upon extending the Wilmot Proviso over the territory acquired from Spain. How did they do it? They voted for the Wilmot Proviso under your instructions, and they voted against it without instructions when it came to the practical test. I think you made no protest until Mr. Douglas demanded one single and last concession "for the purpose," as he said, "of excluding the whole subject from Congress." That was the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise, containing the restrictions for the protection of freedom in the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. Then you sent a noble representative to the Senate in the person of Judge Trumbull. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

A voice—"We'll send him again."

Yes, send him again.

"We will;" "we will."

I marveled when I rose here before you to

day and saw this immense assemblage, which no edifice but only the streets of Chicago could hold. [Cheers and laughter], and I wondered how it would have been had I come here in 1850, or even down at any later day before the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise.

But, fellow-citizens, let by-gones be by-gones. I have seen the time when I had as little courage and as little resolution on this subject as most of you. [Laughter.] I was born into the demoralization—I was born a slaveholder, and have some excuse, which you have not. All these things were done, not because you loved slavery, but because you loved the Union.

When slavery became identical in the public mind with the Union, how natural it was, even for patriotic men, to approve of, or to at least excuse and tolerate slavery. How odious did it become for men to be Free-soilers and be regarded as Abolitionists, when to be an Abolitionist was, in the estimation of mankind, to be a traitor to one's country. How naturally was it then to believe that slavery after all might not be so very bad, and to believe that it might be necessary and might be right at some time, or on some occasion which times and occasions were always a good way off from themselves; especially, how natural was it, when the whole Christian Church, with all its sects, bent itself to the support of the Union, mistaking the claim of slavery for the cause of the Union.

How extensive this proscription for the sake and in the name of Union, has been and is to this day, you will see at once when I tell you that there is not in this whole Republic, from one end of it to the other, a man who maintains that slavery shall not be extended, who can secure, at the hands of his country, any part in the administration of its government from a tide-waiter in the Custom House, or a Postmaster in a rural district, to a Secretary of State, a Minister in a foreign court, or a President of the United States. How could you expect that a people, every one of whom is born with a possible chance, and a fair expectation of being something—perhaps President of the United States—would resist the demoralization prosecuted by such means? And when it becomes a heresy, for which a man is deprived of position in an ecclesiastical sect to which he belongs, how could you expect that the members of the Christian churches would be bold enough to provoke the censure of the Christian world? Above all, our Constitution intended to give us, our frame of government, as we have always supposed, was so established, that it did give us a judiciary which cannot err, which must be infallible, and must not be disputed; and when the Judicial authority, which has the army and the navy, through the direction of the Executive power, to execute its judgments and decrees, pronounces that every appeal made for freedom is seditious, that every syllable in defense of liberty is treason, and the natural sympathy we feel for the oppressed is to be punished as a crime; while that body is unwilling, or at least unable to bring to punishment one single culprit out of the thousand of pirates who bring away slaves from Africa to sell in foreign lands—how could you expect a simple agricultural people such as we are, to be so much wiser and better than our Presidents and Vice-Presidents, Senators and Representatives in Congress, and even our Judges?

I have brought you down, fellow citizens, to the time when this demoralization was almost complete. How assured its ultimate success seemed, after the compromise of 1850, you will learn from a fact which I have never before mentioned, but which I will now: Horace Mann, one of the noblest champions of freedom on this continent, confessed to me, after the passage of the slavery laws of that year, that he despaired of the cause of humanity. In 1854, after the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, without producing so much alarm as a considerable thunder storm would do in the nation, there was only one man left who hoped against the prevailing demoralization and who cheered and sustained me through it; and that man, in his zeal to make his prediction just, was afterwards betrayed so far by his zeal that he became ultimately a monomaniac and suffered on the gallows. That was John Brown. [Sensation.] The first and only time I ever saw him was when he called upon me after the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise, and asked me what I thought of the future. I said I was saddened and disappointed. I would persevere, but it was against hope. He said, "Cheer up, Governor; the people of Kansas will not accept slavery; Kansas will never be a slave State." [Great applause.]

I took then a deliberate survey of the broad field; I considered all; I examined and considered all the political forces which were revealed to my observation. I saw that freedom in the future States of this continent was the necessity of this age, and of this country. I saw that the establishment of this as a Republic, conservative of the rights of human nature, was the cause of the whole world; and I saw that the time had come when men, and women, and children were departing from their homes in the eastern States, and were followed or attended by men, women and children from the European nations—all of them crowded out by the pressure of population upon subsistence in the older parts of the world, and all making their way up the Hudson River, through the Erie Canal, along the railroads, by the way of the Lakes, spreading themselves in a mighty flood, over Michigan, Iowa, Indiana, and Illinois, and even to the banks of the Mississippi. I knew that these emigrants were planting a town every day, and a State every three years, heedless and unconcerned as they were, thinking only of provision for their immediate wants, of shelter and lands to till in the West—I knew the interest they would have when they should get here, and that was, that they should own the land themselves. [Cries of "good, good," and applause]—that slaves should not come into competition with them here. [Renewed applause.]

So, as they passed by me, steamboat load after steamboat load, and railroad train after railroad train, though they were the humblest and perhaps the least educated and least trained portion of the communities from which they had come, I knew that they had the instinct of interest, and below, and deeper than that, the better instinct of justice. [Applause.] And I said, I will trust these men; I will trust these exiles; my faith and reliance henceforth is on the poor, not on the rich; on the humble, not on the great. [Applause.] Aye, and sad it was to confess, but

it was so. I said, henceforth I put my trust not in my native countrymen, but I put it in the exile from foreign lands. He has an abhorrence for, and he has never been accustomed to, slavery by habit. Here he will stay and retain these Territories free. [Applause.]

I was even painfully disappointed at first, in seeing that the emigrants to the West, had no more consciousness of their interest in this question, when they arrived here, than they had in their native countries. The Irishman who had struggled against oppression in his own country, failed me; the German seemed at first, but, thank God, not long, dull, and unconscious of the duty that devolved upon him. This is true; but nevertheless, I said that the interest and instincts of these people would ultimately bring them out, and when the States which they plant and rear and fortify shall apply for admission into the Federal Union, they will come not as slave States but as free States. [Applause.] I looked one step further. I saw how we could redeem all that had been lost; and redeem it, too, by appealing to the very passions and interests that had lost all. [Hear! Hear!]

The process was easy. The slave States of the South had demoralized the free States of the North by giving them presidencies, secretaryships, foreign missions and post offices. And now, here in the Northwest, we will build up more free States than there are slave States.—These free States having a common interest in favor of freedom, equal to that of the Southern Slave States in favor of slavery, will offer to Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Jersey, objects worthy their ambition. [Applause.] And to-day, I see the very realization of it all. I can give you advocates for freedom in the Northern States, as bold, as out-spoken, as brave, and as confident of the durability of the Union, as you can find for slavery in the Southern States. Aye, and when the Southern States demoralize the free States by saying they will give their trade and traffic, buy their silks and their linens, and other trumpery, provided they can buy their principles in the sale and the bargain must be struck, I said, there shall be, in those new free States in the Northwest, men who will say, we will buy your silks and linens, and your trumpery of every sort, we will even buy more, and pay you quite as well, provided you do not betray your principles. [Applause.]

All this was simply restoring the balance of the Republican system, bringing in a counter force in favor of freedom to counteract the established political agencies of slavery. You have heard that I have said that the last Democrat is born in this nation. [Laughter and applause.] I say so, however, with the qualification before used, that by Democrat I mean one who will maintain the *Democratic* principles which constitute the present creed of the Democratic party ["Hear, hear; we understand it"]; and for the reason, a very simple one, that slavery cannot pay any longer, and the Democrat does not work for anybody who does not pay. [Great applause.] I propose to pay all kinds of patriots, hereafter, just as they come. I propose to pay them fair consideration if they will only be true to freedom. I propose to gratify all their aspirations for wealth and power, as much as the slave states can.

But, fellow citizens, we had no party for this principle. There was the trouble. Democracy was the natural ally of slavery in the South. We were either whigs, or if you please, Americans, some of us, and thank God I never was one—in the limited sense of the term. [Cries of "good," "good," and applause.] But the Whig party, or the American party, if not equally an ally of the Slave party, in the South, was, at least, a treacherous and unreliable party for the interests of freedom. [That's so.] Only one thing was wanting, that was, to dislodge from the Democratic party, the Whig party, and the Native American party, men enough to constitute a Republican party—the party of Freedom. [Applause.]

And for that we were indebted to the kindness, unintentional, no doubt, of your distinguished Senator, now a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Douglas—[laughter] who in procuring the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise, so shattered the columns of these parties, as to disintegrate them, and instantly there was the material, the preparation, for the onslaught.

Still there was wanted an occasion; and that occasion was given, when, in an hour of madness, the Democratic party and Administration, with the sympathy, or at least the acquiescence, of the Old Line Whigs and the Native Americans, refused to allow the State of Kansas to exercise the perfect freedom in choosing between liberty and slavery, which they had promised to her, except she should exercise it for slavery. Then came the hour. We had then, fellow-citizens, the material for a party; we had the occasion for a party, and the Republican party sprang into existence at once, full armed. I will never knowingly do evil that good may come of it; I will never even wish that others may do evil that good may come of it; and for the same reason that I know the evil to be certain, and the good only possible or problematical. But no man ever rejoiced more heartily over the birth of his first born than I did when I saw the folly and madness of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the rejection of Kansas. [Applause.] These acts, I said to myself, are the doings of Presidents, of Senators, of Judges, of Priests and of Deacons; and when the Republican party organized itself, I said now is the work complete. [Good! Good!]

How much I have been cheered in this long contest, by seeing that only stolen, surreptitious advantages were gained by slavery in the form of rescripts and edicts, and laws on the statute book; while the cause of freedom brought in first, California; next, New Mexico, with her constitution claiming freedom; next, Kansas; next, Minnesota, and next Oregon; you may all know, if you possibly remember, the song of joy, not so poetic, but as full of truth and happiness, as the song of Miriam, which I then uttered, declaring that that was the end, and the victory was won. [Loud applause.] The battle is ended and the victory is ours. Why then, say they, why not withdraw from the field? For the simple reason that if the victor retire from the field, the vanquished will then come back, and the battle will not be won. Why should the victor withdraw, and surrender all his conquests to the conquered enemy? Why should he place the enemy back upon the field, and withdraw his legions into the far distance, to

give him a chance to re-establish the line that has been broken up?

The Republican party will now complete this great revolution. I know it will, because, in the first place, it clearly perceives its duties. It is unanimous upon this subject. We have had hesitation heretofore, but the creed to which I have already adverted, which issued from that Council Chamber now before me, announced the true determination, and embodies that great, living, national idea of Freedom, with which I began. I know that the Republican party will do it, because it finds the necessary forces in all the free States adequate, I trust, to achieve success, and has forces in reserve, and increasing in every slave State in the Union, and only waiting until the success of the Republican party in the free States will be such as to warrant protection to debate, and free suffrage in the slave States. [Applause.] But, above all, I know it, because the Republican party has, what is necessary in every revolution, chosen the right line of policy. It is the policy of peace and moral suasion; of freedom and suffrage; the policy, not of force, but of reason. [Applause.] It returns kindness for unkindness; fervently increased loyalty for demonstrations of disloyalty; patience as becomes the strong, in contention with the weak. [Applause.]

It leaves the subject of slavery in the slave States to the care and responsibility of the slave States alone—(loud cheers)—abiding by the constitution of the country, which makes the slave States on this subject sovereign; and, trusting that the end cannot be wrong, provided that it shall confine itself within its legitimate line of duty, thereby making Freedom paramount in the Federal Government, and making it the interest of every American citizen to sustain it as such. I know that the Republican party will succeed in this, because it is a positive and an active party. It is the only party in the country that is or can be positive in its action. You have three other parties, or forms of parties, but each of them without the characteristics of a party. You are to choose. The citizen is to choose between the Republican party and one of these.

Try them now by their candidates. Mr. Lincoln represents the Republican party. [Hearty applause.] He represents a party which has determined that not one more slave shall be imported from Africa, or transferred from any slave State, domestic or foreign, and placed upon the common soil of the United States. [Cheers.] If you elect him, you know, and the world knows, what you have got. Take the case of Mr. John Bell, an honorable man; a kind man, and a very learned man, a very patriotic man; a man whom I respect, and in social intercourse quite as much as everywhere else, as here where my word may be regarded as simply complimentary; but what does Mr. John Bell, and his Constitutional Union—what is the name of his party? Constitutional Union, is it not? [Laughter.] What does Mr. Bell and his Constitutional Union party propose on this question? He proposes to ignore it altogether; not to know that there is such a question. If we can suppose such a thing possible as Mr. Bell's election by the people, what then? He ignored the question until the day of election came, but it will not stay ignored. Kansas comes and asks or demands to be admitted into the Union. The Indian Territory, also, south of Kansas, must be vacated by the Indians, and here at once the slaveholders present the question as they will also do in the case of New Mexico. It will not stay ignored. It will not rest. It cannot rest. You have postponed the decision for four years, and that is all. Postponing does not settle it. When defending law suits, I have seen times when I thought I won a great advantage by getting an adjournment, [laughter], but I always found, neveatheless, that it was a great deal better to be beaten in the first instance, and try it again, than to hang my hopes upon an adjournment. [Renewed laughter and applause.]

Take the other; Mr. Breckinridge represents a party that proposes a policy the very opposite of ours. They propose to extend slavery and to use the Federal Government to do it. Let us suppose him elected. Will that satisfy the American people? [Cries of "No, no!"] Will that settle the question? [No, no!] That is only what Mr. Buchanan has already done. And if I should put a vote to this audience, I am sure I should get no vote of confidence in Mr. Buchanan. [No, no, no!] That is of course. But if I were to go into a Bell-and-Everett National Union party meeting, as vast as this, and ask for a vote of confidence in James Buchanan, they would say No, just as emphatically as you do. In the demonstration for Mr. Douglas, which is to be made here day after to-morrow — I shall not be here, and would not have the right to appear if I were — but any of you have the right, by their leave, and you ought not to do it without, to offer and put to vote a resolution of confidence in James Buchanan, and you would get precisely the same negative response that you get here, only a little louder. [Applause and laughter.] Then the people are not going to elect Mr. Breckinridge, because he proposes to follow in the footsteps of Mr. Buchanan, who is rejected. Grant, however, that owing to some misapprehension, or some strange combination, they may obtain all they hope, and indirectly, if not directly, make Mr. Breckinridge President. Suppnse Mr. Breckinridge elected. Does that settle the question in favor of slavery? Then you not only have the combination of the Republicans, and the Constitutional Union party, and the Douglas party to drive him out again, [Laughter,] but you have only postponed the question for four years more, under circumstances far more serious, possibly fatal.

You have now disposed of them all except the Douglas party. Mr. Douglas' party is not a positive party. It proposes just what the Bell party proposes—to ignore the question in Congress. That is just what we find the people will not do, and will not be content to do under John Bell. Why should they like it better under Mr. Douglas? Mr. Douglas and his party say there is a better way. They don't want it ignored, but that it belongs to the Territories, and they can settle it better and more wisely than we can. What can they do? Have they settled it in the Territories in favor of slavery? Are you, are the people of the free States, going to consent to that? If they were, why did they not consent to the proposition of the President, that the people of Kansas should be subjected to slavery under the Lecompton Constitution? Then, they said, that was the act of the people. But if the peo-

ple of the Territory should decide in favor of freedom, are the slave States going to acquiesce? No, because they have their candidate in the person of Mr. Breckinridge to continue the war until they shall regain the lost battle.

But Mr. Douglas' proposition may result in a different way. He says, if I understand him rightly, that it is immaterial to him, at least he has no right and does not propose to decide upon the question, whether they vote slavery up or down. [Laughter.] Then they will vote slavery up in some territories, and vote it down in some other territories. That, fellow citizens, will be Compromise; are you going to be satisfied with a new Compromise? You have tried them, and found that they are never kept. On the whole, you are very sorry that they were ever made.

But is a compromise that is brought about in that way, the irresponsible act of Squatter Sovereignty in the Territories, to satisfy the slave States? They have repudiated Mr. Douglas, the ablest man among them all; they have repudiated him altogether, because they will not be satisfied with a Squatter Sovereignty that gives any Territory whatever to the free States.

I have now demonstrated to you, I think, that the Republican party is the only positive party. But I can show it by another argument. The Republican party has one faith, one creed, one baptism, one candidate, and will have but one victory. The power of slavery has three creeds, three faiths, and is to have three victories. [Laughter.] They have openly confessed, or rather, the secret leaks out, through conversations and consultations, that they do not expect to get a single victory, any more than you expect they will. All their hope and endeavor is to defeat the Republican party, and take the chances for a share of the fruits to result from your defeat. [Applause.]

Suppose they should, by combinations and coalitions, secure the defeat of the Republican party, are you going to stay defeated. [Cries of no, no.] You have been defeated once, have you not? Can you not bear another defeat? [Yes, half a dozen of them.] You will not have to I am sure. [Laughter.] But I am supposing for the purpose of argument that we are defeated by a coalition. Did any one ever know a cause that was lost when it was defeated by a coalition? [No.] There was a coalition in Europe five years ago in which Hungary was defeated by the coalition of Austria with Russia; but Hungary has risen up again to-day, and the coalition is understood to be dissolved. [Applause.] There was a coalition two or three years later, in which Russia was defeated by the combination of France and England; but Russia is just as strong, just as steadily pressing on towards Constantinople to-day, as she has been every day from the time of the Czar Peter until now. And while she has abated nothing of her purposes, and nothing of hope, she has gained strength. So, all the efforts of the statesmen of both France and England are required to keep them from falling out with each other before the battle begins. There is no danger and not much disgrace in being beaten by coalitions; and there is no danger, because they are coalitions. The more the coalitions are necessary, the less are they effectual. One party is always stronger than two other parties, in a contest, unless the whole result is staked upon a single battle.

But, fellow citizens, the explanation of the whole matter is, that there is a time when the nation needs and will require and demand the settlement of subjects of contention. That time has come at last, when the parties in this country, both of the slaveholding states and of the free states, both the slaveholder and the free laboring man, will require an end—a settlement of the conflict. It must be repressed. The time has come to repress it. The people will have it repressed. They are not to be forever disputing upon old issues and controversies. New subjects for national action will come up. This controversy must be settled and ended. The Republican party is the agent, and its success will terminate the contest about slavery in the new states. Let this battle be decided in favor of freedom in the territories, and not one slave will ever be carried into the territories of the United States, and that will end the Irrepressible Conflict. [Great applause.]

And because it is necessary that it should be done, is exactly the reason why it *will* be done. It cannot be settled otherwise, because it involves a question of justice and of conscience. It is for us not merely a question of policy, but a question of moral right and duty. It is wrong, in our judgment, to perpetuate by our votes or to extend slaverv.

It is a very different thing when the slaveholder proposes to extend slavery; for that is, with him, only a question of merchandise. Men, of whatever race or nation, in our estimation, are *men*, not merchandise. According to our faith, they all have a natural right to be men, but in the estimation of the other party, African slaves are not men, but merchandise. It is, therefore, nothing more or less with them than a tariff question; a question of protecting commerce. With us it is a question of human rights, and therefore, when it is settled, and settled in favor of the right, it will stay settled just as every question that is settled in favor of the right always does.

But if it be taken merely as a question of policy, it is equally plain that it will be settled in favor of the Republican side, because our highest policy is the development of the resources and the increase of the population, wealth and strength of the Republic. Every man sees for himself, and no man need be told that the coal, the iron, the lead, the copper, the silver and the gold in our mountains and plains are to be dug out by the human hand, and that the only hand that can dig them is the hand of a freeman. [Great applause.] Every man sees that this wealth, and strength and greatness are to be acquired by human labor, guided by human intelligence and human purpose. Every man knows that the slave, even if he be a white man, will have neither the strength nor the intelligence, nor the virtue to create wealth; for the slave has a simple line of interest before him—it is to effect the least and consume the most. [Hear, hear.]

But, fellow citizens, I seem to myself to have fallen below the dignity and greatness of this question, in discussing a proposition whether free labor or slave labor is more expedient, or more necessary. Let me rise once more, and remind you that we are building a new and great

empire; not building it, a modern Rome and Paris and Naples stand, upon the ruins and over the graves of tenfold greater multitudes of men than those who now occupy their sites; but upon a soil, where we are the first possessors, and the first architects. The tomb and the catacomb in Rome and Paris and Naples are filled with relics and implements of human torture and bondage, showing the ignorance and barbarity of their former occupants. Let us, on the other hand, build up an empire that shall leave no monument or relic among our graves, and no trace in our history, to prove that we were false to the great interests of humanity. Human nature is entitled to a home on this earth somewhere. Where else shall it be if it be not here? Human nature is entitled, among all the nations of the earth, to have a nation that will truly represent, defend and vindicate it. What other nation shall it be, if it be not ours?

People of Illinois! People of the great West! You are all youthful, vigorous, generous. Your States are youthful, vigorous and virtuous. The destinies of our country, the hopes of mankind, the hopes of humanity rest upon you. Ascend, I pray! I conjure you! to the dignity of that high responsibility. Thus acting, you will have peace and harmony and happiness in your future years. The world, looking on, will applaud you and future generations in all ages and in all regions will rise up and call you blessed. [Long continued cheering.]

SPEECH AT LANSING, MICHIGAN.

THE

IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT REAFFIRMED.

The Cincinnati *Commercial* gives the following abstract of Senator Seward's speech at Lansing, Mich., on the 1st inst.:

Fellow Citizens: I was leaving, one misty morning in September, the City of Jerusalem, with my servants and pack-horses to carry provisions and clothing, having four marines of the United States Navy for guard, and an Arab sheik, secured by proper bribes, to give me safe conduct across the mountains of Judea, from the Holy City to the Dead Sea. The Governor had assigned me a janissary, under the responsibility of the bastinado, to see that we got safely out of the dangerous passes. As we climbed one of the lofty hills which skirted the Dead Sea, we came upon a party of native Arabs, who came out to meet us. The janissary rode up to the head of our column, and demanded in a loud voice of the sheik, "How much *man* is here?" [Laughter.] He counted the whole party, and told "how much man" there was by giving the number in our ranks. Standing here in the midst of fifteen thousand freemen, I might ask the same question, in the same sense in which the Arab used it—meaning how many men are here? But flattering as it is to see so many gathered together to listen to my words, I deem it of much more importance to ask, "How *much* man is here," than to inquire how many. I like to speak to as much manhood as I can, while I am quite indifferent as to numbers.

Fellow citizens, it is not, after all, so much a compliance with the kind invitation of the Republicans of Michigan which has brought me here, as it is my own desires. I have an interest in seeing the newly formed Capitol of an embryo State, the organization and development of free institutions, the prosperity of a free people; and I would willingly travel over many more weary miles of corduroy road, if I could reach the centre of such and so prosperous a community. I would gladly derive from the gathered masses of my countrymen the inspiration needful to instruct me in conveying the lessons which our popular life and development are perpetually teaching. Believing, as I do, that man is but for a day, while humanity is universal, I shall have nothing to say about men. If I know myself, I have no prejudice against any man, however widely he may differ from me in opinion. Holding fast to principles, independently of personalities, I wish to say that society always excuses bad measures and bad principles when they are adopted by those whom they approve, and with whom they are accustomed to co-operate. But if I can find out the principles which move men, I shall then be able to judge intelligently how far they are to be trusted as guides. In order to determine any matter justly, we should know the principles involved in it. Nothing new arises before us for settlement, that is not related to what has gone before. What has been of old, was yesterday, is to-day, and will be again to-morrow. We fulfill our part upon the stage, pass off, and let the responsibility devolve upon our successors. Within the past ten years we have added three new States to the Federal Union, and in the next ten years we shall have added four more.

The question that most interests us as patriots is this—What kind of a nation shall we become? We are so far on our way, and now, if the only question for us were how shall we con-

sult our own ease and peace? we might say—we are safe any way. We who are living to-day, and perish to-morrow, are in no danger. If we sought only our own peace we might adopt the indifferent creed of that political philosopher who "don't care whether Slavery is voted up or voted down." But to those coming up after us, the settlement of that question is as vital and important as the settlement of the question of the American Revolution was to our fathers. Why, fellow-citizens, they might have enjoyed peace, and security, and prosperity, and *not cared* for the question that led them to undertake and carry through that arduous revolutionary struggle. But they cared for their posterity, for us, and therefore they settled the question then and there.

Fellow citizens, what you in the West want is, to build a nation which shall be free, prosperous and honored; a nation which shall be acknowledged and revered as the greatest people whom the circling sun has ever looked down upon, from the beginning of time. Do you want anything less? If so, you are not worthy of the great trust committed to your charge. What kind of a nation then do you want? Just such a nation as the State of Michigan; a land where every man may sit, happy and free, not indeed under his own vine and fig-tree, but under his own apple, peach and shade trees, with none to molest or to make him afraid; a land where all the citizens are free to exercise the spontaneous will of freemen. You may go through the whole earth, and you will never find such a body of citizens as this to-day, gathered voluntarily together to discuss and secure their rights. Not in France or Rome or any nation of Europe or Asia, could such a meeting be gathered, without a band of armed dragoons being gathered to disperse and trample them down.

Fellow citizens—I was undertaking to analyze this extraordinary spectacle of a great popular meeting, discussing with dignity and moderation the conduct of their rulers, and prepared to discard from their service every man who has forfeited their confidence. The fact of primary importance here, is that every man is free. I am here surrounded with 15,000 freemen. Now suppose for a moment, fellow citizens, that I was surrounded by 15,000 slaves, or even by 14,000 slaves and 1,000 freemen, and that having the opportunity of assemblage, they were to rise in insurrection and rebellion. Of course I must not say a word of human rights, or they might rise and cut the throats of the 1,000 freemen. There can be no such thing as freedom of debate, where all or many are slaves. Next, the greatness of Michigan consists in the fact that all its citizens are voluntary colonists. They came here not as an enforced emigration—they remain here not because they were born here, but because they are willing to come, and free to stay or to go. Thus, you have not a people gathered only from the shores of Western New York, or born within your own borders, but a people gathered from every State in the Federal Union, and every country of Europe; a people fertile in all those resources which make a great nation; a people which brings from every State just those elements which infuse life, wealth and power. You bring the bold, hardy and enterprising, and the brave and fearless men out of every Christian country on earth. You bring them from England, Ireland, Scotland, France and Italy; and every man who comes is a man fit to be one of the founders of a Free State. [A voice in the crowd, "From Africa, too?"] Reverse this rule, and suppose that instead of this class of useful citizens, you brought only slaves and paupers, or even convicts, as some States export convicts to countries that will take them. What a difference in your civilization and development should we behold! The weak and useless elements in a population never voluntarily emigrate. Boldness, resolution and enterprise are the requirements of successful colonists. No colonies ever succeeded without them. This involves consequences of more importance than at first thought you would be likely to suppose. Can anybody tell me what nation on earth could have made this vast network of railroads which we possess by any other system of labor than ours? Can any body tell me how we could have made it without Irishmen? Can any one tell me, if we had *all* been Irishmen, how we could ever have got this railway system organized?

I am coming now to the question which my respected friend from a distance has asked me. Now suppose, by any course of policy which you should adopt, you could discourage and prevent freemen from any part of the world from coming in here? The European States would send their refuse classes—their convicts to colonize you. There would never be, thanks to the Providence that guides above, convicts enough to constitute a great country, but there would be enough to deteriorate fatally the character, the prosperity and the virtue of the people. To multiply such classes of population, is but to multiply weakness. What kind of labor should we have, if the freemen, the independent citizens from all countries, were to be met with some such discouraging policy as this? What would you have to supply the place of that great, busy, enterprising free labor which now distinguishes you? What could you have, but what South Carolina and Georgia fell back upon to replace the need of free labor settlers—the importation, namely, through the employment of New York vessels, of African negroes, at $100 a head, to settle, and clear up, and develop the State of Michigan. Now you have happily escaped that one great evil of having Africans brought here compulsorily to perform that labor. And how have you been enabled to escape it? By the wisdom and foresight of our forefathers, who, by the Ordinance of 1787, declared that neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude should exist in all your borders. Because there were men in those days wise enough to look across the broad fields of the West and anticipate that there would be those who would seek to cover them with Slavery. Is there a man in the State of Michigan who would be willing to-day that there should exist one single, solitary slave, obliged and bound to perform involuntary labor within the State of Michigan? [Cries of "No! No!"] If I take out a freeman and put in a slave, what happens? More than the loss of an enterprising and useful citizen—the loss of virtue—the loss of the spirit and energy that exists only with entire freedom. Let it once be understood that Slavery may exist here, and all the emigrants would desert Michigan at once. The two systems of labor cannot exist as a permanent form of civilization together. *There is* an irrepressible conflict. [Loud and

long continued cheers.] Introduce Slavery, and you expel Freedom. Introduce Freedom, and Slavery will, sooner or later, die. Now, from the beginning of my existence in politics, I have seen this conflict, and I have considered that my bounden duty as a patriot was to see to it, so far as it depended upon my action, that every new State should be a Free State, and to diminish it in the Slave States so far as, constitutionally, it could be done. That is the whole question. If I am wrong, I am grievously wrong.

Let us see what is the alternative, if I am wrong. Did you ever know of a State peopled exclusively by freemen that was in any danger from domestic insurrection, foreign invasion, or civil war? Is there any Slave State but will confess itself to-day in danger of insurrection? A few madmen organized at Chatham, in Canada, enter the oldest and proudest of the Southern States of this Union with a handful of pikes and spears —and straightway the Commonwealth of Virginia quivers and shakes with the terrors of domestic insurrection and servile war. Kentucky expels from her borders freemen who defend freedom within her limits, and Tennessee visits with the stake and faggot slaves who aspire to freedom. What do we see this moment in Texas —a State young and vigorous like Michigan, and priding herself upon still greater significance and power? She is convulsed with an almost universal panic because Slavery is discussed among a portion of her citizens.

But, I am asked, why interfere in this matter? why not stand aloof, and let it take care of itself, and adopt the Illinois Senator's maxim of entire non-intervention. I will tell you why. We are maintaining a standing army, of the heavy cost of one thousand dollars per man; and a standing navy, which is large, though not very effective; and what are we maintaining it for? To take care of Michigan; to protect New York, or Massachusetts, or Ohio, against internal or external violence? No; there is not a nation on the face of the earth which would dare to attack these free States, or any of them, if they were even disunited. But we are doing it in order that slaves may not escape from slave States into the free, and to secure those States from domestic insurrection, and because, if we provoke a foreign foe, Slavery cries out that it is in danger. Have I not a right to say that if it were possible, I would rather not have an army and navy — rather not wring from the hand of free labor its earnings to increase an army, whose tendency always and everywhere is to corrupt public virtue.

What, then, fellow citizens, are my limits? Simply these. The Constitution of the United States makes you and me sovereigns over the Territories for their good. They are vacant, unoccupied, unimproved; and if left to themselves, the cupidity of the slaveholder and the slave-trader would lead them to enter them and colonize them with Slavery. And this would be done by a surprise—by a movement, which, while it might not people the Territory with Slavery, would introduce enough to demoralize all the people, and turn them all into apologists for Slavery, upon a principle which, I am ashamed to confess, has ruled this nation for forty years. It is this: that for the sake of peace, of harmony, of quiet, we will sacrifice justice, freedom and the welfare of posterity. It is that for the sake of living on good terms with your neighbors, while they will not give up an error, or a prejudice, or a principle, *you will.* There is no virtue among us—no reliance on God—no justice, no public conscience, that is equal to our dread of the oft-repeated menace, that if we don't give up freedom, right, justice and everything else, they will set on fire this great temple of constitutional liberty and consume us all. [Loud cheers.] Fellow citizens, I have no hope for these United States, but in the existence of such honest, candid, considerate citizens as will look earnestly into these things and interest themselves in their just determination. Give me such a man, and I care not whether he votes now for Douglas or Breckinridge, I'll have him a friend of freedom before he dies, [applause,] or if he goes an unrepentant Democrat to his grave, I'll have his children.

Fellow citizens, if Gen. Cass had so administered your Territorial Government of Michigan as to encourage the introduction of one thousand slaves, your noble Commonwealth would now have been a Slave State. That is what has been done with Texas, where, in a fine agricultural State, adapted to free labor, Slavery is not only established, but we are bound, by the very act of admission, to accept four more new Slave States out of her soil. That is what would have been done with Kansas had we not fought and struggled against it with all the energy of freemen. Now, fellow citizens, if the man who owns his own land is to be replaced by a man who is willing that another man should own him as a slave, the quality of society is deteriorated; and I believe that if you bring the question right home to any sound, right-minded man, he would say, I would much rather you would make a slave of me than to forge your manacles for any man who is under my protection and care. All that is wanted in order to settle this matter rightly is to make sure that all our efforts converge to the one great end of fostering Freedom and discouraging Slavery.

They tell us that Popular Sovereignty will work out the result of Freedom. So it would, if in Congress and in the Administration, you had the active friends of Freedom instead of men who are on the other side. But, whenever you have got to that point you have arrived where the advocates of that convenient doctrine will not follow you. Popular Sovereignty is good only to establish Slavery. Its virtues are not appreciated when it works the other way.—[Laughter and applause.] You will find no advocates of Popular Sovereignty among the Democracy after the 6th day of November next. And then you come right to the great issue of the irrepressible conflict, and if you don't like the conduct of affairs—why, four years are soon ended, and all who are opposed to it will have a fair opportunity in the next Presidential election to fix the machinery for another four years.—[Cheers.] All, on the other hand, which we have to do, is to take care that no missteps give occasion to charge us with abuse of the great trust committed to our hands. All will be well if we redeem the confidence of those to whom we have opened up the war to help secure our national welfare. All will go right when our efforts are directed to reclaim for us, a place in the family of free nations, and to secure for us the respect and confidence of mankind.

ON THE MISSOURI BORDER.

HIS

SPEECH AND ENTHUSIASTIC RECEPTION AT ST. JOSEPH.

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen and Fellow Citizens—I think that I have, some time before this, said that the most interesting and agreeable surprise that ever human being had on this earth was that which Columbus felt when—after his long and tedious voyage in search of a continent, the existence of which was unknown to himself, as to all mankind, and the evidence of whose existence was nothing but a suggestion of his own philosophy, surrounded as he was by a mutinous crew, who were determined on the destruction of his own life if he should continue the voyage unsuccessfully another day—he went out at night on the deck of his little vessel, and there rose up before him the dark shadow of an island, lighted up by the dwellings of human beings like himself. That was the most interesting surprise that ever occurred to any man on earth. And yet I do not think that Columbus was much more surprised than I and those who are with me have been to-night.

We have been traveling in a land of friends and brethren, through many States, from Maine to Missouri!—along the shores of the ocean, along the shores of the great lakes and the banks of great rivers—and I will not deny that our footsteps have been made pleasant by kind and friendly and fraternal greetings. We entered the soil of Missouri this morning, at ten o'clock, feeling that, although we had a right to regard the people of Missouri as our brethren, and although we were their brethren and friends, yet we were to be regarded by its citizens as strangers, if not as aliens and enemies; but this welcome which greets us here surpasses anything that we have experienced in our sojournings from Bangor, in the State of Maine, to this place. The discovery that here there is so much of kindness for us, so much of respect and consideration, takes us by surprise. [Applause.] I will not deny that it affects us with deep sensibility, for we did not propose to visit St. Joseph. There is a land beyond you—a land redeemed and saved for freedom, through trials and sufferings that have commended its young and growing people to the respect of mankind and to our peculiar sympathy.

We proposed to be quiet travelers through the State of Missouri, hoping and expecting without stopping here, to rest this night on the other side of the Missouri, where we knew we would be welcome. [A voice—"We won't hurt you."] No, I know you won't hurt me. The man who never wished evil to any human being, who challenges enemies as well as friends to show the wrong of which any being made in his own form can accuse him when he comes before the bar of Justice, has no fear of being harmed in the country of his birth and of his affection. But I stated that not merely for the purpose of showing how agreeable is the fraternal welcome. It is full of promise. I pass over all that has been said to me of consideration for myself. There are subjects on which I take no verdict from my fellow citizens. I choose to take the approbation if I can get it, of my conscience, and to wait till a future age for the respect and consideration of mankind. [Applause.] But I will dwell for one moment on this extraordinary scene, full of assurance on many points, and interesting to every one of you as it is to me.

The most cheering fact, as it is the most striking one in it, is that we who are visitors and pilgrims to Kansas, beyond you, find that we have reached Kansas already on the northern shores of the Missouri river. [Hurrah.] Now come up here you—if there are any such before me—who are so accustomed to sound an alarm about the danger of a dissolution of the Union; come up here, and look at the scene of Kansas and Missouri, so lately hostile, brought together on either shore in the bonds of fraternal affection and friendship. [Loud cheers.] That is exactly what will always occur whenever you attempt to divide this people and to set one portion against another. The moment you have brought the people to the point where there is the least degree of danger to the national existence felt, then those whom party malice or party ambition have arrayed against each other as enemies, will embrace each other as friends and brethren. [Enthusiastic applause.]

Let me tell you this simple truth: that though you live in a land of slavery there is not a man among you who does not love slavery less than he loves the Union. [Applause.] Nor have I ever met the man who loved freedom so much under any of the aspects involved in the present Presidential issues as he loved the Union, for it is only through the stability and perpetuity of this Union that any blessings whatever may be expected to descend on the American people.

And now, fellow citizens, there is another lesson which this occasion and this demonstration teach. They teach that there is no difference whatever in the natures, constitutions or character of the people of the several States of this Union, or of the several sections of this Union. They are all of one nature, even if they are not all native born and educated in the same sentiments. Although many of them came from distant lands, still the very effect of being an American citizen is to make them all alike.

I will tell you why this is so. The reason is simply this: The Democratic principle that every man ought to be the owner of the soil that he cultivates, and the owner of the limbs and the head that he applies to that culture, has been adopted in some of the States earlier than in others; and where it was adopted earliest it has worked out the fruits of higher advancement, of greater enterprise, of greater prosperity. Where it has not been adopted, enterprise and industry have languished in proportion. *But it is going through; it is bound to go through.* [A voice—"Not here."] *Yes, here. As it has already gone through eighteen States of the Union so it is bound to go through all of the other fifteen. It is bound to go through all of the thirty-three States of the Union for the simple reason that it is* GOING THROUGH THE WORLD." [Enthusiastic cheering.]

Reception and Speeches at St. Louis and Springfield.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. LINCOLN

Sketch of "Old Abe," &c.

Mr. SEWARD said that he had not come to see St. Louis or the people of Missouri, but to see Kansas, which was entitled to his gratitude and respect. Missouri could take care of herself; she did not care for Republican principles, but warred with them altogether. If forty years ago Missouri had chosen to be a Free State, she would now have four millions of people instead of one million. He was a plain spoken man, and here was talking treason in the streets of St. Louis. He could not talk anything else if he talked as an honest man, but he found himself out of place here. [A Voice—"You're at home."]

Here, said he, are the people of Missouri, who ask me to make a speech, and at the same time there are laws as to what kind of speech I may make. The first duty that you owe to your city and yourselves is to repeal and abrogate every law on your statute book that prohibits a man from saying what his honest judgment and sentiment and heart tell him is the truth. [Mingled surprise and approbation on the part of the crowd.] Though I have said these hard things about the State of Missouri, I have no hard sentiments about it or St. Louis, for I have great faith and hope—nay, absolute trust—in Providence and the American people. What Missouri wants is courage, resolution, spirit, manhood—not consenting to take only that privilege of speech that slaveholders allow, but insisting on complete freedom of speech.

But I have full trust that it will all come right in the end; that in ten years you will double your population, and that in fifteen or twenty years you will have four millions of people. To secure that, you have but to let every man who comes here from whatever state or nation, speak out what he believes will promote the interests and welfare of mankind. What surprised me in Kansas was to see the vast improvements made there within six years, with so little wealth or strength among the people; and what surprised me in Missouri was that, with such a vast territory and with such great resources, there was so little of population, improvement and strength to be found. [Faint manifestations of approval.] I ought not, perhaps, to talk these things to you.

I should have begun at the other end of the story, though a citizen of any other State has as much liberty here as the citizens of Missouri; but he has less liberty than I like. I want more than you have. I want to speak what I think, instead of what a Missourian thinks. I think you are in a fair way of shaming your Government into an enlightened position. You are in the way of being Germanized into it. I would much rather you had got into it by being Americanized instead of Germanized; but it is better to come to it through that way than not to come to it at all.

It was through the Germans Germanizing Great Britain that Magna Charta was obtained, and that that great charter of English liberty came to be the charter of the liberties of the sons of England throughout the whole world. Whatever lies in my power to do to bring into successful and practical operation the great principle that this government is a government for free men and not for slaves or slaveholders, and that this country is to be the home of the exile from every land, I shall do as you are going to do by supporting Abraham Lincoln for President, and Hannibal Hamlin for Vice-President. [Cheers.]

At Springfield, where Mr. Lincoln resides, there was a crowd awaiting the arrival of the train, and a salute was fired as it approached the station. There was a rush into and about the windows of the car in which Mr. Seward was seated. Among those who pressed forward to shake him by the hand was Mr. Lincoln himself. His portraits bear a sufficient resemblance to him to make recognition easy, and yet he is not by any means so hard featured and almost repulsive looking as they represent him.

On the contrary, while no one would call him

a good looking man, neither would any one be repelled by his aspect. The good humored expression that lurks about his clear gray eye, travels the one long, deep curved furrow down his cheek, and makes its home somewhere in the region of his capacious mouth, must always make him friends. He dresses in the ordinary style of Western lawyers, black cloth swallow-tailed coat, and pants fitting tightly to his long, bony frame; the inevitable black satin vest, open low down, and displaying a broad field of shirt bosom, the collar being turned down over a black silk neckerchief.

The crowd commenced to vociferate for Seward and finally succeeded in getting him out to the platform. After alluding to the extent of his trip, he said:

I am happy to express, on behalf of the party with whom I am traveling, our gratitude and acknowledgments for this kind and generous reception at the home of your distinguished fellow-citizen, our excellent and honored candidate for the Chief Magistracy of the United States. If there is in any part of the country a deeper interest felt in his election than there is in any other part, it must of course be here, where he has lived a life of usefulness; where he is surrounded by the companions of his labors and of his public services. We are happy to report to you, although we have traveled over a large part of the country, we have found no doubtful States. [Applause.]

You would naturally expect that I should say something about the temper and disposition of the State of New York. The State of New York will give a generous and cheerful and effective support to your neighbor, Abraham Lincoln. I have heard about combinations and coalitions there, and I have been urged from the beginning to abandon this journey and turn back on my footsteps. Whenever I shall find any reason to suspect that the majority which the State of New York will give for the Republican candidate, will be less than 60,000, [cheers,] I may do so The State of New York never fails—never flinches. She has been committed from the beginning, as she will be to the end, under all circumstances, to the great principles of the Republican party.

She voted to establish this a land of freedom for you in 1787. She sustained the Ordinance of '87 till you were able to take care of yourselves. Among the first acts of her government, she abolished slavery for herself. She has known nothing of compromises, nothing of condition or qualification in this great principle, and she never will. She will sustain your distinguished neighbor because she knows he is true to this great principle, and when she has helped to elect him, by giving as large a majority as can be given by any half dozen other States, then you will find that she will ask less, exact less, from him, and support him more faithfully than any other State can do. That is the way she did with John Quincy Adams, that is the way she sustained Gen. Taylor, and that is the way she will sustain Gen. Lincoln. [Great cheers.]

There were loud calls for Gen. Nye, to which he responded. While he was speaking the two great Republican leaders had a few words of general conversation in the car, within the hearing of those around them. They expressed themselves satisfied as to the result of the election.

Mr. Lincoln said: Twelve years ago you told me that this cause would be successful, and ever since I have believed that it would be. Even if it did not succeed now, my faith would not be shaken.

An invitation was extended to the party to go to some place not definitely understood. They left the car for the purpose in Mr. Lincoln's company, but, finding that the train would only stop a few moments, they turned back, shook hands with the President expectant, and resumed their seats. Mr. Seward was cheered as the train swept through the town.

SPEECH AT MADISON, WISCONSIN,

September 12, 1860.

DUTY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE NORTHWEST.

Fellow-Citizens—It is a bright September sun that is shining down upon us—such a sun as nature, pleased with the remembrance of her own beneficence, seems to delight in sending forth to grace the close of a season which has been crowned with abundance and luxuriance, unknown even to her own habitual profuseness. It is such a sun as nature, pleased with seeing the growth of a noble capital in a great State, may be supposed to send out to illuminate and to make more effulgent the magnificent beauties of the place in which we are assembled. It is such a September sun as we might almost suppose nature, sympathizing with the efforts of good men, lovers of liberty, anxious to secure their own freedom, to perpetuate that freedom for the enjoyment of their posterity, and to extend its blessings throughout the whole world, and for all generations, may have sent forth in token of sympathy with such a noble race. [Applause.] But, fellow citizens, bright and cheerful as this hour is, my heart is oppressed, and I am unable

at once to lift myself above the sadness of recent scenes and painful recollections. I obeyed the command of the Republican people of Wisconsin to appear before them on this, the 12th day of September; and as I approached the beautiful seaport, if I may so call the city that crowns the shores of Lake Michigan, and affords entrance to this magnificent State, I had anticipated, because I had become habituated to, a welcome that should be distinguished by the light of a thousand torches, and by the voices of music and of cannon. But the angel of death passed just before me on the way, and instead of footsteps lighted with the greeting of thousands of my fellow citizens, I found only a thick darkness, the gloom increased, as only nature's darkness can be, by the weeping and wailing of mothers for the loss of children, and refusing to be comforted. I have been quite unable to rise from that sudden shock; to forget that instead of the voice of a kind and merry and genial welcome, I heard only mourning and lamentation in the streets.

To you, perhaps, the scene seems somewhat foreign, because it occurred in your beautiful seaport, but it was not merely a municipal calamity. It is a calamity and disaster that befalls the State, and strikes home dismay and horror to the bosoms of all its people, for those were citizens of the State who perished, and those who survive are the mourners; the desolate widows and orphans who are bereaved. Let me, before I proceed, take the liberty to bring this subject home to the State authorities of Wisconsin, and to ask and to implore that nothing may be left undone, if there is yet anything that can be done, to rescue a single sufferer from that dreadful calamity, and to bring to the comforts of social life, and of a sound, good, religious, and public education, the orphans who are left to wander on the streets by the lake side.

Fellow citizens, it is a political law—and when I say political law, I mean a higher law—[cries of "good,"]—a law of Providence, that empire has, for the last three thousand years, so long as we have records of civilization, made its way constantly westward, and that it must continue to move on westward until the tides of the renewed and of the decaying civilizations of the world meet on the shores of the Pacific Ocean. Within a year I have seemed to myself to follow the track of empire in its westward march for three thousand years. I stood but a year ago on the hill of Calvary. I stood soon afterward on the Pirœus of Athens. Again I found myself on the banks of the Tiber. Still advancing westward I rested under the shades of the palaces of the kings of England, and trod the streets of the now renovated capital of France. From those capitals I made my way at last to Washington, the city of established empire for the present generation of men, and of influence over the destinies of mankind. [Applause.]

Empire moves far more rapidly in modern than it did in ancient times. The empire established at Washington, is of less than a hundred years formation. It was the empire of thirteen Atlantic American States. Still practically the mission of that empire is fulfilled. The power that directs it is ready to pass away from those thirteen States, and although held and exercised under the same Constitution and national form of government, yet it is now in the very act of being transferred from the thirteen States east of the Alleghany mountains and on the coast of the Atlantic ocean, to the twenty States that lie west of the Alleghanies, and stretch away from their base to the base of the Rocky Mountains. The political power of the Republic, the empire is already here in the plain that stretches between the great lakes on the east and the base of the Rocky Mountains on the west; and you are heirs to it. When the next census shall reveal your power, you will be found to be the masters of the United States of America, and through them the dominating political power of the world. [Applause—and voice, "Amen."] Our mission, if I may say that I belong to that eastern and falling empire instead of the rising western one—the mission of the thirteen States has been practically accomplished. And what is it? Just like the mission of every other power on earth. To reproduce, to produce a new and greater and better power than we have been ourselves, [applause,] to introduce on the stage of human affairs twenty new States and to prepare the way for twenty more, before whose rising greatness and splendor, all our own achievements pale and fade away. We have done this with as much forethought perhaps as any people ever exercised, by saving the broad domain which you and these other forty States are to occupy, saving it for your possession, and so far as we had virtue enough, by surrounding it with barriers against the intrusion of ignorance, superstition and slavery. [Applause.]

Because you are to rise to the ascendant and exercise a dominating influence, you are not, therefore, to cast off the ancient and honored thirteen that opened the way for you and marshaled you into this noble possession, nor are you to cast off the new States of the West. But you are to lay still broader foundations, and to erect still more noble columns to sustain the empire which our fathers established, and which it is the manifest will of our Heavenly Father shall reach from the shores of the lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean. It was a free government which they established, and it was a self-government—a government such as, on so large a scale, or indeed on any scale, has never before existed. I know that when you consider what a magnificent destiny you have before you, to lay your hand on the Atlantic coast, and to extend your power to the Pacific ocean and grasp the great commerce of the east, you will fully appreciate the responsibility. It is only to be done by maintaining the Democratic system of government. There is no other name given under heaven by which, in this generation, nations can be saved from desolation and ruin, than Democracy. This, to many conservative ears, would seem a strange proposition, and yet it is so simple that I lack the power almost of elucidating it. Look at England. She is ambitious, as she well may be, and ought to be, to retain that dominion, reaching into every part of the habitable globe which she now exercises. She is likely to do it, too, and may do it, by reducing, every successive year, the power of her aristocracy, and introducing more and more, the popular element of Democracy into the administration of our government.

In many respects the government of England, though more aristocratic, is still less monarchical than our own. The British empire exists to-day

only by recognizing and gradually adopting the great truth that if the British empire is to stand, it is the British people who are to maintain that empire and enjoy and exercise it. France, the other great European power, which seems to stand firmer now than ever, and to be renewing her career of prosperity and glory—France, under the form of a despotism, has adopted the principle of universal suffrage, and the empire of France to-day is a democracy. The Austrian empire is falling. And why? Because democracy is rising in Germany to demand the liberation of the people of its various nations, and the exercise of universal suffrage. And Italy to-day all along the coast of the Mediterranean, is rising up to the dignity of renewed national life, by adopting the principle of universal suffrage and the limitation of power by the action of the whole people.

Now if in the Old World, where government and empire are entrenched and established so strong in hereditary aristocracy, no empire can stand except as it yields to the democratic principle; look around over the United States of America, and say how long you can hold these States in a federal union or maintain one common authority or empire here, except on the principles of democracy? Therefore, it is that, I say, that you of the northwest are, above all things, first, last, and all the time, to recognize as the great element of the republic, the system and principles of democracy.

But, fellow citizens, it is easy to talk about democracy. I have heard some men prate of it by the hour, and admire it, and shout for it, and express their reverence for it; and yet I have seen that they never comprehend the simplest element of democracy? What is it? Is it the opposite of monarchy or of aristocracy? Aristocracy is maintained everywhere, in all lands, by one of two systems, or by both combined. An aristocracy is the government in which the privileged own the lands, and the many unprivileged work them, or in which the few privileged own the laborers and the laborers work for them. In either case the laborer works on compulsion, and under the constraint of force; and in either case he takes that which may remain after the wants of the owners of land or labor are both satisfied. The laborer must rest content with the privilege of being protected in his personal rights; and the powers of the government are exercised by the owner, of labor and of land.

Here, then, you see I have brought you to the consideration of the great problem of society in this republic or empire. It is this: Is there any danger that in the United States the citizen will not be the owner of the land which he cultivates? If there is any part of the United States where the labor or the land is monopolized by capital, there is a place in which the democratic element has not yet had its introduction or been permitted to work its way effectually. So, on the other hand, as here, where you are, no man can monopolize the land which another man is obliged to cultivate, much less monopolize the labor by which the lands on your fields are cultivated, you are entirely and absolutely established and grounded on democratic principles. But, you all know, that has not always been the history of our whole country, and, at times, was not the condition of any part of it Some two hundred years ago, when laborers were scarce, and the field to be cultivated was large, private citizens of the Atlantic States, driven, as they said, by the cupidity of the British Government, introduced the labor of slaves into the American Colonies, and then established the aristocracy of land and labor. The system pervaded nearly the whole Atlantic States. If it had not been interrupted it would have pervaded the Continent of America; and instead of what you see, and of what you are a part, and of what you do,—instead of emigration from the Eastern States into the prairies of the West, and instead of emigration from Europe all over the United States, you would have had in the Northwest this day the Boston and New York merchant importing laborers instead of freemen into the seaports, and dispersing them over the entire valley of the Mississippi. That would have been the condition of civilization on this continent. It has been fortunate for you, and fortunate for us, that such a desecration of the magnificent scene, provided by nature for the improvement of human society and for the increase of human happiness, has been arrested so soon; and you will see how felicitous it is when for one moment you compare the condition of Wisconsin, and of Maine, and of Iowa, and of Illinois, and of Indiana, and of all the Free States of the Union, with the Islands of the West Indies, colonized just at the same time that the Atlantic States were colonized, and with the condition of South America, a whole and entire new continent, abounding in the most luxuriant vegetation and with the greatest resources of mineral wealth, absolutely reduced to a condition of perpetual civil war, and ever renewed ruinous desolation. The salvation of North America from all those disasters that have befallen the Southern portion of the continent is the result of bold and firm procedure on the part of your ancestors and mine, less than a hundred years ago.

The Government of the United States was established in an auspicious moment. The world had become aroused to the injustice as well as to the inexpediency of the system of Slavery, and the people of the United States, rising up to the dignity of the decision that was before them, determined to prevent the further extension, as far and fast as possible, to secure the abolition of African Slavery. It was under the influence of a high, righteous, noble, humane excitement like that, that even the State of Virginia, itself a Slave State, like the State of New York, determined that, so far as her power and her will could command the future, Slavery should cease forever; first, by abolishing the African Slave Trade, which would bring about, ultimately, the cessation of domestic Slavery; and, in the second place, by declaring that her consent to the cession of territory northwest of the Ohio, of which you occupy so beautiful a part, was given with the express condition that it should never be the home of Slavery or involuntary servitude. [Applause.]

But, fellow citizens, I need not remind you that this, like most other efforts of human society to do good and to advance the welfare of mankind, had its painful and unfortunate reaction. Hardly twenty years had elapsed after the passage of those noble acts for the foundation of liberty on the North American continent, before

there came over the nation a tide of demoralization, the results of which, coming on us with such fearful rapidity, surpass almost our power to describe or to sufficiently deplore.

What have we seen since that was done? We have seen the people of the United States—for it is of no use to cast responsibility on parties, or administrations, or statesmen—extend slavery all around the coast of the Gulf of Mexico. We have seen them take Texas into the Union and agree that she should come in as a Slave State, and have the right to multiply herself into four more Slave States. We have seen California and New Mexico conquered by the people of the United States, with the deliberate consent, if not purpose, that Slavery should be extended from the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean. We have seen the Constitution of the United States, perverted by the consent of the people until that Constitution, instead of being a law of freedom and a citadel of human rights, has come to be pronounced by the affected judgment and willing consent of the highest tribunal of the United States, yet enjoying the confidence and support of the people, to be a tower and bulwark of human slavery, of African bondage; and you have it now announced by the government of the United States, which you yourselves brought into power, that wherever the Constitution of the United States goes, it carries, not freedom with the eagles of conquest, but hateful bondage. [Applause.] If the principle which you have thus permitted to be established is true, then there is not an arsenal within the United States, not a military or naval school of the federal government, not a federal jail, not a dock yard, not a ship that traverses the ocean, bearing the American flag in any part of the land, where the law, the normal law, the law by which men are tried and judged, is not a law by which every man whose ancestor was a slave is a slave, and by which property in slaves, not freedom of man, is the real condition of society under the federal system of government. I can only ask you to consider for a moment how near you have come to losing everything which you enjoy of this great interest of freedom. The battle culminated at last on the fields of Kansas.

How severe and how dreadful a battle that has been, you all know. It was a great and desperate effort of the aristocracy of capital in labor, to carry their system practically with all its evils to the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, and to cut off the Atlantic States from all communication with the sister States on the Pacific, and so extend Slavery from the centre, both ways, restoring it throughout the whole country. You will say that this was a very visionary attempt; but it was far from being visionary. It was possible, and for a time seemed fearfully probable—probable for this reason, that the land must have labor, and that it must be either the labor of freemen or the labor of slaves. Introduce slave labor in any way that you can, and free labor is repelled, and avoids it. Slave labor was introduced into this country by the opening of the African slave trade, and when the Territory of the United States, in the interior of the continent was open to Slavery with your consent and mine, nothing then would have remained but to reopen and restore the African slave trade; for it is prohibited only by a law, and the same power that made the law could repeal and abrogate it. The same power that abrogated the Missouri Compromise in 1854, would, if the efforts to establish Slavery in Kansas had been successful, have been, after a short time, bold enough, daring enough, desperate enough, to have repealed the prohibition of the African slave trade. And, indeed, that is yet a possibility now; for, disguise these issues now before the American people as they may be disguised by the Democratic party, yet it is nevertheless perfectly true, that if you forego your opposition and resistance to Slavery, if this popular resistance should be withdrawn, or should, for any reason, cease, then the African slave trade, which at first illegally renews itself along the coasts of our Southern States, would gradually steal up the Mississippi, until the people, tired with a hopeless resistance, should become indifferent, and African Slavery would once more become the disgraceful trade of the American flag.

Now, all these evils would have happened all this abandonment of the continent of North America to slavery would have happened, and have been inevitable, had resistance to it depended alone on the people of the thirteen original States. We were already overpowered there. From one end of the Atlantic States to the other, there were, in 1850, scarcely three States which did not declare that henceforth they gave up the contest, and that they were willing that the people of the new Territories might have slavery or freedom, and might come into the Union as slave States or as free States, just as they pleased.

When that had happened, what would have followed? Why, that the people who had the right to slavery if they pleased, had the right to get slaves if they pleased. How then were we saved? It seems almost as if it was Providential that these new States of the Northwest, the State of Michigan, the State of Wisconsin, the State of Iowa, the State of Maryland, the State of Ohio, founded on this reservation for freedom that had been made in the year 1787, matured just in the critical moment to interpose, to rally the free States of the Atlantic coast, to call them back to their ancient principles, to nerve them to sustain them in the contest at the Capital, and to send their noble and true sons and daughters to the plains of Kansas, to defend, at the peril of their homes, and even their lives, if need were, the precious soil which had been abandoned by the Government to slavery from the intrusion of that, the greatest evil that has ever befallen our land. [Applause.] You matured in the right time. And how came you to mature? How came you to be better, wiser, than we of the Atlantic States? The reason is a simple one, perfectly plain. Your soil had been never polluted by the footprints of a slave. Every foot of ours had been redeemed from slavery. You are a people educated in the love of freedom, and to whom the practice of freedom and of Democracy belongs, for every one of you own the land you cultivate, and no human being that has ever trodden it has worn the manacles of a slave. [Loud applause.] And you come from other regions too. You come from the South, where you knew the evils of slavery. You come from Germany and from Ireland, and from Holland and from France, and from all over the face of the globe, where you have learned by experience the sufferings that result from aristocracy and oppression. [Ap-

plause.] And you brought away with you from your homes the sentiments, the education of freemen. You came then just at the right moment. You came prepared. You came qualified. You came sent by the Almighty to rescue this land and the whole continent from slavery. Did ever men have a more glorious duty to perform, or a more beneficent destiny before them than the people of the northwestern angle that lies between the Ohio river and the great lakes and the Mississippi? I am glad to see that you are worthy of it, that you appreciate it.

It does not need that I should stimulate you by an appeal to your patriotism, to your love of justice, and to your honor, to perfect this great work, to persevere in it until you shall bring the Government of the United States to stand hereafter as it stood forty years ago, a tower of freedom, and a refuge for the oppressed of all lands, instead of a bulwark of slavery. [Applause.] I prefer rather to deal in what may perhaps be not less pleasing to you, and that is, to tell you that the whole responsibility rests henceforth directly or indirectly on the people of the northwest. Abandon that responsibility, and slavery extends from the Gulf of Mexico to the Gulf of St. Lawrence on the Atlantic coast. There can be no virtue in commercial and manufacturing communities to maintain a Democracy, when the Democracy themselves do not want a Democracy. [Laughter.] There is no virtue in Pearl street, in Wall street, in Court street, in Chestnut street, in any other street of great commercial cities, that can save the great Democratic Government of ours, when you cease to uphold it with your intelligent votes, your strong and mighty hands. You must, therefore, lead us, as we heretofore reserved and prepared the way for you. We resign to you the banner of human rights and human liberty, on this continent, and we bid you be firm, bold and onward, and then you may hope that we will be able to follow you.

I have said that you are to have the responsibility alone. I have shown you that in the Atlantic Northern States we were dependent on you. I need not tell you that at present you can expect no effective support or sympathy in the Atlantic Southern States.

You must demonstrate the wisdom of our cause by argument, by reason, by the firm exercise of suffrage, in every way in which the human intelligence and human judgment can be convinced of truth and right—you must demonstrate it, giving line upon line and precept upon precept, overcoming passion and prejudice and enmity, with gentleness, with patience, with loving kindness to your brethren of the Slave States, until they shall see that the way of wisdom which you have chosen, is also the path of peace. [Applause.] The Southwest are sharers with you of the Northwest in this great inheritance of empire. It belongs equally to them and to you. They have plains as beautiful. They have rivers as noble. They have all the elements of wealth, prosperity, and power that you have. Still from them, from Kentucky and Tennessee, from Missouri and Arkansas, from Alabama and Missouri, and Louisiana, you will for the present, receive no aid or support; but you will have to maintain your principles in opposition, although I trust, not in defiance of them—and that, for the simple reason that in the great year 1787, when Mr. Jefferson proposed that Slavery should be excluded in all the public domain of the United States, lying southwest, as well as that lying northwest of the Ohio river, those States had not the forecast, had not the judgment, to surrender the temporary conveniences and advantages of Slavery, and to elect, as your ancestors chose for you, the great system of Free Labor. They chose Slavery, and they have to drag out, for some years yet, not long, not so long as some of you will live, but still so long that they will be a drag and a weight upon your movements, instead of lending you assistance—they have got to drag out, to the end, their system of Slave Labor. You have, therefore, as you see, the whole responsibility. It depends upon you. You have no reliance upon the Atlantic States of the east, north or south. You have the opposition of the southern States on either side of the Alleghany mountains; but still the power is with you. You are situated where all powers have ever been, that have controlled the destiny of the nation to which they belonged. You are in the land which produces the wheat and the corn, the cereal grains—the land that is covered with the oak, and where they say the Slave cannot live. They are in the land that produces cotton and sugar, and the tropical fruits—in the land where *they say* the white man cannot labor, in the land where the white man must perish if he have not a negro Slave to provide him with food and raiment. [Laughter.] They do, indeed, command the mouths of the rivers; but what is that worth, except as they derive perpetual supplies, perpetual moral reinvigoration, from the hardy sons of the north, that reside around the sources of those mighty rivers? [Applause.]

I am sure that, in this, I am speaking only words of truth and experience. The northwest is by no means so small as you may think it; I speak to you because I feel that I am, and, during all my mature life, have been one of you. Although of New York, I am still a citizen of the northwest. [Good.] The northwest extends eastward to the base of the Alleghany mountains, and does not all of Western New York lie westward of the Alleghany mountains? [Good.]

Whence comes all the inspiration of free soil, which spreads itself with such cheerful voices over all these plains? Why, from New York, westward of the Alleghany mountains. The people before me—who are you but New York men, while you are men of the northwest? It is an old proverb, that men change the skies but not their minds, when they emigrate; but you have changed neither skies nor mind. [Applause.] I might call the roll of Western New York, and I doubt not that, when I came to Herkimer county, I should have a response. I certainly have had responses here from Cayuga and Genesee [A voice: "Erie"], and from Erie [A voice: "Auburn"], and from Auburn [A voice: "Seneca"], and from Seneca [A voice: "Yates"], and from Yates; aye, aye. [Loud laughter.] Bless my soul! I have been laboring under a delusion all the time. I thought I was out here, midway between the Mississippi and the Lakes, and I find I am standing on the stage in the centre park at home. [A voice: "Right at home."] [Another voice: "And old Ontario."] And old Ontario. We will not forget old Ontario, nor old Oswego, nor Oneida.

Fellow citizens, I will add but one word more; this is not the business of this day alone. It is not the business of this year alone. It is not the business of the northwest alone. It is the interest, the destiny of human society on the continent. You are to make this whole continent, from north to south, from east to west, a land of freedom and a land of happiness. [Applause.] There is no power on earth now existing, no empire existing, or as yet established, that is to equal or can equal in duration the future of the United States. It is not for ourselves alone; you have the least possible interest in it. It is, indeed, for those children of yours. Old John Adams, when at the close of the revolutionary war he sat down and counted up the losses and sacrifices that he had endured and made, rejoiced in the establishment of the independence which had been the great object of his life, and said, "I have gained nothing. I should have been even more comfortable, perhaps, and more quiet, had we remained under the British dominion; but for my children, and for their children, and for the children of the generation that labored with me, I feel that we have done a work which entitles us to rejoice, and call upon us by our successes to render our thanks to Almighty God."

GOVERNOR SEWARD'S

EVENING SPEECH AT DETROIT,

September 4, 1860.

In the evening, after Mr. Seward had made his great speech in Detroit, he was called upon at his lodgings (Senator Chandler's) by an immense multitude.

Senator Chandler made a few remarks, and then gave way to Senator Seward. Loud cheers were given for Seward as he came forward to the edge of the balcony. He said:

Fellow Citizens: If I appear in obedience to your call to-night, I hope it will only be a new illustration of an old practice of mine, never to give up an honest and virtuous attempt, though I might fail in it the first time. I tried to-day and utterly failed to make the Republicans of Michigan hear, and now, in obedience to your call to-night, renew the effort. The end, on the part of the people, is at hand. It is now upon us, and the simple reason is that the people have become at last attentive, willing to be convinced, and satisfied of the soundness of the Republican faith. It has been a task. We had first to reach the young through the prejudices of the old. I have never expected my own age and generation to relinquish the prejudices in which they and I were born. I have expected, as has been the case heretofore in the history of mankind, that the old would remain unconverted, and that the great work of reformation and progress would rest with the young. That has come at last, for though the Democratic party have denied the ascendency and obligations of the "higher law," still they bear testimony to it in their lives if not in their conversation. [Laughter.] Democracy will die in obedience to "higher law," and Republicans are born, and will be born, and none but Republicans will be born in the United States after the year of 1860. [Laughter and applause.] The first generation of the young men of the country, educated in the Republican faith, has appeared in your presence by a strong and bold demonstrative representation to-night. It is the young men who constitute the Wide-Awake force. Ten years ago, and twenty years ago, the Wide-Awake force were incapable of being organized. Four years ago it was organized for the distraction of the country and the Republican cause. To-day the young men of the United States are for the first time on the side of freedom against slavery. [Great applause.] Go on, then, and do your work. Put this great cause into the keeping of your great, honest, worthy leader, Abraham Lincoln. [A voice—"The irrepressible conflict."] Believe me sincere when I say that if it had devolved upon me to select from all men in the United States a man to whom I should confide the standard of this cause—which is the object for which I have lived and for which I would be willing to die—that man would have been Abraham Lincoln. [Great applause.]

GOVERNOR SEWARD'S

SPEECH AT LA CROSSE, WISCONSIN,

September 14, 1860.

Gov. Seward reached La Crosse at ten o'clock this morning, and found a large crowd of citizens —with the inevitable Wide-Awakes among them —assembled on the levee. An address of welcome was presented to Mr. Seward, on the deck of the steamboat, to which he replied as follows:

Fellow Citizens—It has always been my purpose to anticipate the progress of civilization in the West, by visiting the interior portion of the continent before the Indian and his canoe have given place to the white man, the steamer, the railroad and the telegraph. With that view, I explored, in 1856, the banks of Lake Superior, one year only in advance of the establishment of civilization at Sault St. Marie. It has been my misfortune that I have not been able to execute my purpose to visit the Upper Mississippi until I find that I can no longer trace on its shores or bluffs, or among the people who gather around me, a single feature of the portraits of Catlin, which first made me acquainted with this wonderful and romantic region. I must take you as I find you. I have come here at last, attended by a few friends from the Eastern States —from Ohio, from New York, from Michigan, from Massachusetts—with them to see for ourselves the wonders of this great civilization which are opening here to herald the establishment of political power and empire in the Northwest. But our anticipations are surpassed by what we see. None of us would have believed that elegant cities would have so rapidly sprung up on these shores; nor would we have looked for such evidences of improvement and development as would require a hundred years to execute in the States from which we come. This is gratifying to us, because it shows how rapidly the American people can improve resources, develop wealth, and establish constitutional power and guarantees for the protection of freedom. If we found you isolated and separate communities, distinct from ourselves, we still should be obliged to rejoice in such evidences of prosperity and growing greatness. How much more gratifying it is for us to find, in everything that we see and hear, abundant evidences that we are, after all, not separate and distinct peoples—not distinct peoples of Iowa, Wisconsin, New York and Massachusetts, but that we are one people—from Plymouth Rock at least to the banks of the Mississippi and to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. *It is an assurance that enables us to trample under our feet every menace, every threat of disunion, every alarm and apprehension of the dismemberment of this great empire;* for we find in the sentiments which you have expressed to us to-day precisely the sentiments which were kindled two hundred years ago on Plymouth Rock, and which are spreading wider and wider, taking deeper and deeper roots in the American soil. They give us the sure and reliable guarantee that under every possible change of condition and circumstance the American people will nowhere forget the common interests, the common affections and the common destiny which make them all one people.

Mr. Seward addressed a large audience in the afternoon. He said that he found it difficult to discuss things of the past. Slavery, said he, as a federal institution, is obsolete in this land. Only one argument remains to the Democracy. It comes to us loudly and clamorously from the Southern States, and querulously and timidly from among ourselves. It is that if we do not choose to give up the contest, and if we elect our candidate, the fabric of this Union shall be broken down and shall perish in ruins. That is the only argument left—that the Union will be dissolved if we succeed in electing the honorable statesman from Illinois, Abraham Lincoln. Well, I propose to address a few words to you on the subject, and to examine how imminent that danger is with which we are menaced. The Union is to be dissolved. Certainly. Why not, if Abraham Lincoln, or the Congress of the United States acting with him, shall commit any overt act that shall be unjust or oppressive to the slave States or to any portion of the Union? But they will not wait for that, and they are very wise in not waiting for it, because if they put their threats on that condition they would, in the first place, have no argument against Mr. Lincoln's election, and in the next place they would have to wait until after the election before they raised the argument. [Laughter.] So it must be on the condition, pure and simple, that Abraham Lincoln shall be elected President of the United States.

Well, if he be elected, it will be by a majority of the American people expressing their choice for him under the forms of the constitution, and by the laws made by slaveholders and his opponents, equally with freesoilers and their friends, if Abraham Lincoln shall be elected lawfully and constitutionally, then the government is to come down. Bless my soul, fellow-citizens, what can we do? If we like Abraham Lincoln, as I am sure you do—don't you?—[aye, aye,—] if all the people of the United States like him better than they like John Bell, or Stephen A. Douglas, or Mr. Breckinridge, how can we help his being elected? [Laughter and applause.] If he shall be elected, what is that more than the people of the United States have been guilty of doing for seventy years, every fourth year—

electing one man whom they like better than any other man? Is there anything wrong in that? Can you contrive any way in which you can elect a minority man—a man whom the people do not like? If so, I should like to see the patent produced. What kind of government would it be if we elected a man we did not like instead of a man we did like? My impression is that it would be a government not differing very far from the empire of Austria, where they always manage to elect a man whom the people do not like, and where they have an admirable way of saving the Union by organizing an army of 500,000 men armed to the teeth to maintain the man whom the people do not like, rather than let them have the man whom they do like. [A Voice—That is the way the democrats are doing here.] That is the way they would do everywhere; but that is the very thing which cannot be done here. Fellow citizens, let me say to you that those who talk about destroying this Union, and even those who fear that it is going to be destroyed because the people do what they lawfully may do and what they have a constitutional right to do, know nothing at all of the subject of which they are talking. They have no idea of what the Union is. They have never raised their thoughts so high, nor examined its foundations so low, nor surveyed its proportions broadly enough to know what this Union is. They understand it as a copartnership of thirty-three States, fifteen of which delight in the slave trade, and eighteen of which dislike and repudiate the slave trade, and prefer the hiring and compensation of free laborers.

We may call slavery by gentle names or modest terms, but slavery is nothing less than the trade in slaves, for it makes merchandise of the bodies and souls of men. Now these fifteen States have the right and have the power, the unquestionable and undeniable power, to carry on this trade in slaves within these fifteen States themselves. We do not interfere with them. We have no right to interfere with them. They are sovereign on that subject, and are exempt from our control. But when it comes to the federal Union—the Union which is the government over us all—there their right to trade in slaves in the Territories of the United States has ceased, because the constitution is a constitution to establish justice, not injustice; to maintain peace not by force, but by the consent of the governed, and to perpetuate, not the curse of slavery, but the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity forever. This Union is this nation—is this empire of thirty millions of people. It is not made for mere trade, much less for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is made for the happiness of the people, for the development of the material resources of the country, to guarantee peace and safety to every citizen in this broad land, and to guarantee him in the full enjoyment of all his rights of life, liberty and property. It opens to him this vast continent for the pursuit of happiness, and by its power acting on the governments of the Old World and of the New, it makes the American citizen the citizen of the world. [Applause.] This Union of ours gives us a property in the tombs at Quincy and Mount Vernon, and in the battle fields of Bunker Hill, and Saratoga, and Yorktown. Are these all to be surrendered if any State among us should become discontented because they are not able to secure all the special advantages from the Union that seem to be desirable?

If the Union is to be dissolved, I have shown that the way is not very easy to do it. Now let me know who is to do it? It has been said that Alabama and Missouri, and Mississippi and Louisiana, and Florida and South Carolina, will go out, and then the Union will be dissolved. They say, "you will not try to take us back; you will not dare to imbrue your hands in brothers' blood to re-establish by force of conquest a Union which we have repudiated and dissolved." They are right. We do not propose to do any such thing. In the first place those States are not going out. If they go out they go out for a cause, and that cause is to save slavery. Well, what are they in for, but to have slavery saved for them by the federal Union? Why would they go out, for they could not maintain and defend themselves against their own slaves? We would see them march up, one after another, under the black flag, trampling under foot those stars and stripes of ours. If it were possible I should like to see the experiment of old Massachusetts going out and endeavoring to carry Plymouth rock with her, or I would like to see New York go out and carry the harbor and Catskill mountains with her. What do you think the rest of the States would say? I think they would fold their arms and see whether they behaved themselves, and they would let them stay out just as long as they behaved themselves. Well, what would they do if they got out and did not behave themselves. If New York should levy taxes and imposts, and instead of paying them into the national exchequer should keep them on her own account, that would not be behaving well. Those who think that for nothing or for any imaginary cause, the Union is to be dissolved or destroyed, have no idea of the nature of the government under which they live, or of the character of the people. Go on, then, and do your duty. The lesson of public life is one that is easy to be learned. It resolves itself simply into this—to ascertain, as you always can, what, in the day in which you live, is the great work for the welfare of mankind; do that work fearlessly, in the love of your fellow men and in the fear of God, and the Union will survive you and me and your posterity for a thousand years. [Applause.]

GOVERNOR SEWARD'S

SPEECH AT LEAVENWORTH, KANSAS

September 28, 1860.

Mr. SEWARD returned from Lawrence to Leavenworth on Thursday, hoping to escape any further attention in the latter town, but he was not so fortunate. The Wide Awakes mustered in considerable numbers, and with music, transparencies and flaming torches, marched to the Planters' Hotel, where there was already a large crowd assembled. Mr. Seward could not resist the demand made upon him, and so he, though unwillingly, left his room, walked down to the parlor and stepping through the open window presented himself, all unattended, on the stand which had been constructed in front of the building. His appearance was greeted with enthusiastic cheers, and he found himself, like Mr. Douglas, "betrayed" into making a speech.

He indulged in anticipation of the time when on this broad continent there was to be no other power than that of the United States, and descanted on the importance of their position midway between the two oceans. One or more great States, he said, must rise here in the valley of the Mississippi. It might have been, and would have been, if her people had been as wise as you are, that State which lies opposite you on the Missouri river. I do not know that the State of Missouri will not yet be that great State, for there is a hope, there is assurance, that Missouri will ultimately, taught by the instruction you are giving her and the example you are setting her, be a free State. She has soil as fertile, skies as genial, as those with which God has blessed any portion of the earth. That State will ultimately be one of the greatest, most respected, most prosperous, most honored States in this American Union.

Still he treated of the fundamental conditions of a State and of a republic, which conditions are simply these: securing to every man equal and exact justice, and the fullest opportunity for the improvement of his own condition and the elevation of his own character by the laws and customs that we establish. In this respect you are ahead of Missouri, ahead of Nebraska, ahead of Iowa, and ahead of every State in the American Union, by reason of the great injustice suffered, the great wrongs endured, and the great resolution and courage with which you have overcome them all. Freedom in the Territories of the United States is to all the rest of the world a mere abstraction. But it has been your misfortune that your Territory was made the theatre of a conflict, the theatre of the trial of that "irrepressible conflict"—[laughter and cheers]—a conflict of mind with mind, voice with voice, vote with vote, of bullet against bullet, and of cannon against cannon. [Loud and tumultuous cheering.] You have acquired the education of freedom by practical experience. You have the start of all the other States. If there is a people in any part of the world I ought to cherish with enduring respect, with the warmest gratitude and with the deepest interest, assuredly it is the people of Kansas; for, but for the practical trial they have given to the system which I had adopted, but for the vindication at so much risk and so much cost of their highest rights under the law, I, for one, would have gone to my grave a disappointed man, a false teacher in the estimation of the American people. [Applause.] Yours is the thirty-first of thirty-four States of the Union which I have visited for the purpose of knowing their soil, their skies and their people. I have visited, in the course of my lifetime, more than three-fourths of the civilized nations of the world; and of all the States and nations which I have seen, that people which I hold to be the wisest, the worthiest and the best, is the people of this little State. [Applause.] The reason of it is the old proverb that "Handsome is that handsome does." If other nations have higher education, greater refinement, and have cultivated the virtues and refinements of civilized life more than you have, I have yet to see the nation or the people that has been able, in its very inception, in its infancy, in its very organization, to meet the shock of the aristocratic system, through which other nations have been injured or ruined, to repel all attacks, and to come out before the world in the attitude of a people who will not, under any form of persuasion, seduction or intimidation, consent, any one of them, to be a slave, any one of them to make a slave, any one of them to hold a slave, or any foot of their territory to be trod by a slave, or by a man who is not equal to every other man in the eye of the law. [Applause.]

GOVERNOR SEWARD'S

SPEECH AT ATCHISON, KANSAS,

September 28, 1860

Mr. Seward was warmly welcomed by the citizens and ladies of Atchison, and among others by Mr. Fairchild, the Mayor, himself a democrat, and by General Pomeroy. He was introduced to the assemblage by Mr. Martin, and made a very effective speech. Referring to the apology made by Mr. Martin, for the inadequacy of the reception, he said that they might judge of what he himself thought of it, when he declared to them that his welcome bore all the impress of those that he had seen given in other countries to hereditary despots. Compared with other demonstrations in the Territory, this was unsurpassed. [Atchison was one of the "border ruffian" towns on the Missouri river.—Rep.] He said he had tried to avoid all this demonstration, which only tended to make him misunderstood, for the world might think that in coming to Kansas he came to receive honors, instead of coming to learn what was necessary to enable him to perform his duty to her citizens better than he had heretofore been able to do.

I find, said he, the Territory of Kansas as rich as, if not richer, in its soil and in its evidences of material prosperity, than any State with which I have been acquainted, and I have already visited thirty-one of the thirty-four States of the Union. In climate I know of none that seems to be so desirable. It is now suffering—in its southern and western counties more especially—the privations of want, falling very heavily on its latest settlers, resulting from the absence of rain for a period of ten or twelve months. I go out of the Territory of Kansas with a sadness that hangs over and depresses me—not because I have not found the country far surpassing all my expectations of its improvement and cultivation—not because I have not found here a prosperous and happy people—but because I have found families—some from my own State, some from other States and some from foreign countries—who were induced—and justly and wisely induced—to come to this region within the last year or two, and who, having exhausted all their means and all their resources in establishing homes for themselves, have been disappointed in gaining from their labor provision for the supply of their wants.

I hope that the tales which I have heard are exaggerated, and that families are not actually perishing for want in some of the western counties of Kansas. I have faith in the complete success of your system, and in the prosperity and development of the State of Kansas; I have it for the most obvious reason, that if Kansas is a failure my whole life has been worse than a failure; but if Kansas shall prove a success—as I know it will—then I shall stand redeemed, at least in history, for the interest I have taken in the establishment of civilization on the banks of the Missouri river upon the principles and policy which you have laid down. I pray you—you who are rich, you who are prosperous—to appoint active and careful men to make researches in the Territory for those who are suffering by this dreadful visitation of Providence; to take care that the emigrant who came in last winter and last spring be not suffered, through disappointment and want, to return to the State whence he came, carrying back a tale of suffering and privation and distress which might retard for years the development of society here. I hope you will not regard this advice of mine as being without warrant. I give it for your own sake—I give it for the sake of the people of Kansas, as well as because my sympathies have been moved by the distress I have seen around me.

If this advice shall be taken in good part, then I am free to tell you that in my judgment there is not the least necessity for any person leaving this Territory, notwithstanding the greatness of the calamity that has befallen it. *I have seen whole districts that have produced neither the winter wheat, nor the spring wheat, nor the rye, nor the buckwheat, nor the potatoe, nor the root of any kind;* yet I have seen on all your prairies, upland and bottom land, cattle and horses in great numbers, and all of them in most perfect condition; and I am sure that there is a supply of stock in this Territory which, if disposed of, would produce all that is necessary to relieve every one in the Territory. What is required, therefore, is simply that you should seek out want where it exists, and apply your own surplus means to relieve it. If this should fail, and if you should feel it necessary to apply to your countrymen in the East for aid, I will second that appeal—I and the gentlemen who have been visiting the country with me—and it will not be our fault if we do not send back from the East the material comforts that will cheer and reanimate those who are depressed and suffering. This State, larger than any of the old thirteen States, has not one acre that is unsusceptible of cultivation; not one foot that may not be made productive of the supplies of the wants of human life, comforts and luxuries. The question was propounded to me—not of my seeking—it came before me, because I was in a position where I must meet all questions of this kind—it came some six years ago: Do the interests of human society require that this land of Kansas should be possessed by slaveholders and cultivated with slaves, or possessed and cultivated by free men, every one of whom shall own the land which he cultivates and the muscles with which he tills the earth? When I look back at that period, only six or seven years ago, it seems

strange to me that any man living on this continent, himself a free man and having children who are free, himself a free laborer and having children who must be free laborers, himself earning his own subsistence and having children who must depend on their own efforts for their support, should be willing to resign a portion of this continent so great, a soil so rich, a climate so genial, to the support of African negroes instead of white men.

Africa was not crowded for Kansas. Africa has never sent to this country one voluntary exile or emigrant, and never will. The sons of Africa have lands which for them are more productive, have habits more congenial and skies better tempered than yours are. I have supposed it far better, therefore, to leave the people of Africa where God planted them, on their native shores. But the case was different with men of my own race—the white men, the blue-eyed men, the yellow-haired men of England, of Ireland, of Scotland, of France, of Germany, of Italy. Ever since this continent was discovered oppression in every form has been driving them from those lands to seek homes for their subsistence and support on this continent. There is no difference between us all except this: that my father was driven out of Europe by want and privation some hundred years ago; and others some hundred years later, and some have just come, and tens of thousands, aye, millions, have yet to come. We are all exiles directly, or represent those who were exiles—all exiles made by oppression, superstition and tyranny in Europe. We are of one family, race and kindred, all here in the pursuit of happiness—all seeking to improve our condition—all seeking to elevate our character. My sympathies have gone with this class of men. My efforts have been, as they must always be, to lay open before them the vast regions of this continent, to the end that we may establish here a higher, a better, and a happier civilization than that from which ourselves or our ancestors were exiled in foreign lands.

This land should not only be a land of freedom, a land of knowledge and religion, but it should be, above all, a land which, as yet cannot be said with truth of any part of Europe or any other part of the world, a land of civil liberty—and a land can only be made a land of liberty by adopting the principle which has never yet obtained in Europe, and which is only to be attained by learning it from ourselves—that is, that every human being, being necessarily born the subject of a government, is a member of the State, and has a natural right to be a member of the State, and that, in the language of the Declaration of Independence, all men are born equal and have inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Some of the States were not established on this principle. They were established a long time ago, and under circumstances which prevented the adoption of this principle. For those States, members of our Union who have been unable or even unwilling to adopt this principle, I have only to say that I leave them free to enjoy whatever of happiness, and to attain whatever of prosperity, they can enjoy and attain with their system. But when I am called upon to establish a government for a new State, then I demand the application of the principles of the Declaration of Independence—[applause]—that every man ought to be and should be a free man. Society can have but two forms by which the individual can defend himself from oppression. *One is that which puts the musket into his hand and tells him as the last resort to defend himself and his liberty. The other is that which puts into his hand the ballot, and tells him in every exigency to defend his rights with the ballot. I do maintain that in founding a new State we have the perfect liberty as well as the perfect right to establish a government which shall secure every man in his rights; or rather, I do say that you must put into every man's hand—not into the hands of one—the ballot; or put into every man's hand, and not into the hands of a few, the bullet, so that every man shall be equal before the law in his power as a citizen. All men shall have the ballot, or none; all men shall have the bullet, or none.* [Applause.]

GOVERNOR SEWARD'S

SPEECH AT CLEVELAND, OHIO,

OCTOBER 4, 1860.

Gov. Seward being introduced was received with rousing cheers. He spoke as follows:

Several Republican citizens, of more eastern States than this, including myself, have been making a tour of observation in the West. We have found every reason to believe, and trust confidently, that Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana and Minnesota, are safe for the Republican cause in the coming election. [Cheers.] We also know of no Eastern Free State that is doubtful. I am reported, as I find, to have said at Springfield that I have been urged from home to go back to the State of New York: This is erroneous. What I did say was, that some ill-informed Republicans in the West had been alarmed by the reports of coalitions formed, or attempted to be formed, by the opposition in that State, and asked me whether I

thought it was necessary to go home and look after my own State. I say now, as I said then, that I should go home when I found any reason to believe that the Republican majority was in any danger of being reduced below 60,000. I have had no advices of that kind, and no communications from the State of New York during this journey except from a respectable lady residing at Auburn, who confines herself to taking charge of her children and mine, and leaves politics to take care of themselves.

We have visited Kansas, and I ask your leave to bring the condition of that Territory before you, for your careful and kind consideration. The soil and the skies of Kansas are as propitious as any people on earth ever enjoyed—the people as free, as true and as brave as any in the world. They are suffering severely from a drought so great that I think it was scarcely exaggerated when they told me they had had no rain in a large portion of the Territory for a whole year. We found that whole districts had produced less vegetable support for human life than are to be found in many a garden which we have passed in coming through the State of Ohio. Districts in which the winter wheat, sowed last year, was necessarily plowed up and sowed in the spring with spring wheat. The spring wheat was plowed up and the ground planted with corn. The corn proved a failure and was followed with potatoes. The potatoes were blasted, and followed by buckwheat, which also proved a failure. I think that this is a true description of the condition of tillage of perhaps two-thirds of Kansas. Still, there will be no great famine or distress there. The occupants who have been there for two, three, four or five years are comfortable and well-to-do, as appears abundantly from their stock, their fences, their dwelling houses—framed of wood, and very often substantially and well built of brick and stone. Large portions of the State are as populous, and exhibit all the signs of comfort and thrift, equal to what are found even in Ohio. But there are emigrants who have resided there for only a year whose whole means have been expended in procuring farms and shelter, and planting their crops, which have successively failed. Many of these are leaving the Territory—some say so many as one hundred a day. They ought to be relieved, and a very little assistance would enable them to remain there and retain their possessions and improvements, and resume the culture of their fields, under more favorable auspices, next spring. With much diffidence, I beg to commend this subject to the citizens of Ohio. Perhaps a larger portion of the Republicans of Kansas are emigrants from Ohio than from any other State. Do not forget that Kansas is the most important outpost of the Republican army; that it is yet, on paper at least, in a state of siege; though the enemy has been driven out, a treaty of peace and independence has not yet been signed.

Fellow citizens, I am unable to make you what is called a speech, for I have left my voice at Chicago; but I will say something, in order, if possible, to not altogether disappoint any expectations which you may entertain. You have come together, not for amusement, or to gratify passion or prejudice. Each of you, as a citizen of the United States, is invested with a portion of sovereignty over the greatest and most important nation of the world. Time is divided into past, present and the future, but there is in truth no present. Each one of us, therefore, lives in and for the past, or for the future. The worst use of time that could be made is to employ it in concerns of the past. The past ought to have taken care of itself; if it has not we can do nothing to change it. The future, only, is subject in any degree to our control and direction. The past was the time of tradition; the Revolution of '76, the Republican Revolution of 1800, the war of 1812, the Tariff controversy, the question of the Bank of the United States, have passed away, with the generations which discussed or acted in them. A man may have his opinion upon one or other of those subjects, but it leads to no practical conclusion now. Action for the future concerns freedom or slavery within the territories of the United States, and to discharge our responsibilities well and wisely, we must bury our traditions, emancipate ourselves and become free, enlightened and intelligent men. The Past was for the East—the Future is for the West. Empire has culminated in the East, and is now passing to the West. The Past was for Slavery, which at one time was practically universal in the East. The Future is Freedom, which, in the order of Providence, is to be universal in the West.

The change from past Eastern Slavery to future Western Freedom is to be effected simply by bringing the mind of the nation to a just apprehension of what slavery is. Our Fathers in the East understood it to be a question simply of trade. In their view, while they allowed the practice of slavery, they held a slave to be a subject of commerce. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, announced on the other hand, that slavery is a question of human rights. While they left the regulation of that subject within the States themselves, they did establish the principle that in the common Territories of the United States and within the sphere of Federal action, every man is a person, a man, a free man, who could neither hold another in slavery nor be held in bondage by any other man. The past (since the adoption of the Constitution) has been occupied with trials to compromise this conflict between property in man and the freedom of man, and these trials have proved unsuccessful. The future demands the settlement of it now by a return to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. This conclusion can be reached only by accepting the principle of the political equality of men within the exclusive range of the Federal Constitution. This is simply a matter of education. It is not worth while to spend much time upon this subject in trying to convert old men; they cannot last long, and therefore can do little harm. We all become settled in our opinions and confirmed in our habits as we grow old. The Republican party is a party chiefly of the young men. Each successive year brings into its ranks an increasing proportion of the young men of this country.

This is the ground of my hope, of my confidence, that before this generation shall have passed away, the Democratic party will cease to exist; and the Republican party, or at least its principles, will be accepted and universally prevail. If it be true, as the Declaration of Independence asserts, that the right of all men to

political equality is self-evident, nothing can prevent the acknowledgment of that fact by the generation now rising, since that truth is distinctly inculcated now for the first time through all the agencies of private and public education. The young man who shall reject it will find himself in controversy with the ever-growing sentiment of his countrymen, and the settled public opinion of the world. Let him take heed how he enters upon a course which can bring nothing but unavailing contention, disappointment and regret over the failure of his ambition and of his desire for usefulness. Train up your children in the belief of this great principle of our Constitution, and they will secure for themselves the satisfaction of leading useful and honorable lives, and follow you to your graves with more than even filial veneration.

GOVERNOR SEWARD'S

SPEECH AT BUFFALO, NEW YORK,

OCTOBER 5, 1860.

Fellow Citizens—I understand this demonstration. It is only kindness that makes it turbulent. But in order that you may hear a voice which has been exercised for five weeks, it will be necessary for you to hold your tongues and open your ears. I am now within a hundred and fifty miles of my home, and I remember that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country." So am I not going to prophesy so near my own place of residence. I thank you sincerely for this welcome of myself and of the party with whom I have been traveling in the far West.

I have seen, within a year, all the principal people who inhabit the shores of the Mediterranean; and within the last five weeks have journeyed among the population dwelling along the Mediterranean of America. I have seen those decayed and desolate countries—the sites of the greatest nations of antiquity—now covered with ruins and some in a state almost of semi-barbarism. The chief cause of that decay and desolation I believe to have been the existence in those countries of human bondage.

The one great evil which could bring down our country to such a level, would be the introduction of Slavery to the lands surrounding the Mediterranean of America. Therefore it is that I have devoted what little talent I possess to prevent the ban of Slavery from falling upon the fertile valleys of the Mississippi and Missouri.

Having seen many States, I come back to New York, prouder of her, and prouder that I belong to her, than I was when I left. I estimate her so highly, not alone for what she is or has, *at home*, but also for what she is and has in the Great West. While I see around me here, so many generous and noble men endeavoring to maintain her in her proud position, I have also found, all along the shores of the great lakes, along the banks of the great rivers, and even at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, children of the State of New York, almost as numerous as at home. Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois and Kansas, are all daughters of New York, so is California, and more States have been formed under her auspices, then there were at the beginning of the Union. Emigrants from Erie county, from Chautauqua, from Cattaraugus, from Oswego, and from all the counties of this great State, people the West. It was a son of New York who first applied steam to locomotion; a citizen of New York, and also its chief magistrate, who began and perfected the Erie Canal, and over that canal the stream of emigration has flowed which has founded new States. It has carried, sometimes, in a day the people of a western town, a county in a few weeks, and a State in two or three years. New York has built the West.

But I am, perhaps, speaking in too general terms. Doubtless the spirit which animates you at present, is roused in regard to the coming election. It will gladden you when I say in relation to the state of the West, and I have had assurances there which leave no doubt that it will give its vote for Lincoln. I have seen him at his own home, and I have now to say, as I said before I went West, that he is a man eminently worthy of the support of every honest voter, and well qualified to discharge the duties of the Chief Magistracy. Above all, he is *reliable;* and I repeat at the foot of Lake Erie, what I said at the head of it; that if it had fallen to me to name a man to be elected as next President of the United States, I would have chosen Abraham Lincoln.

I have promised out West that the State of New York will give him 60,000 majority in November. Am I right in this? [A voice, "double it!"] Then you are to multiply that by two, are you? Well, that is no more than you ought to do, and if you keep "wide awake" it is no more than you *can* do.

Now, my friends, I am deliberating on this estimate of yours, and I wish to know what you have to say for Erie county. What majority will Erie county give? [Divers answers were made to this query; "5,000" seemed to be the prevalent figure; others said, 2,500 out of the city of Buffalo.] Mr. Seward: Aye, you count majorities in the rural districts. That is right and safe too.

It is very fortunate that whatever may be the way with the population on the sidewalks, the rural districts are safe for freedom. Why, gentlemen, you couldn't take any man three months from Main street, out into the free open country, without converting him from Democracy and making him so that he would never think of voting for a Democratic candidate, or a two-faced candidate, or a candidate with half a dozen principles. Well! we'll see what we can do with the cities this time. When the cities begin to find out that they are not going to rule the country, they will conclude, perhaps, that it is better that the country should rule them.

It is very strange that Irishmen and Germans and Swedes, so long as they remain on the sidewalks, should wish to be ruled by men in the interest of the slave power. [Cries, "It is not so here."] But you say, it is not so here. I have been West and have seen foreigners there also who did not wish to be ruled by slaveholders.

But I have already talked more than I had intended, and must stop. [A voice, "What about Kansas?"] You wish to hear about Kansas? I will tell you. What is the population of Buffalo? [A voice, "81,000."] Well, whenever the city of Buffalo shall have come to be inhabited by 100,000, or 103,000—which is just the population of Kansas—as virtuous, as wise, as brave, as fearless as the 103,000 of Kansas, there will be an end of the "irrepressible conflict." Good night.

GOVERNOR SEWARD'S

SPEECH AT LAWRENCE, KANSAS,

SEPTEMBER 26. 1860.

Fellow Citizens—A long cherished desire of mine is fulfilled; at last, a long deferred duty is about to be paid—the desire of my heart to see the people of Kansas—the duty that I felt I owed to the people of Kansas, to see them in their own homes and in their own houses. I have visited your chief cities Leavenworth and Lawrence—where the army of mercenaries sent by the Slave States battered down the hotel, under an indictment and conviction in a court of the United States as a nuisance, because it sheltered the freemen who had come here to see Freedom established in Kansas. And I have looked, also, upon the Constitution Hall, in Topeka, where the army of the United States, for the first time in the history of our nation, dispersed a lawful and peaceable assembly of citizens of the United States, convened to counsel upon the best means of protecting their lives, their property and sacred honor. You, people of Kansas, whom I have not been able to see in your homes, have come up here to greet me, from the valleys of the Kansas, the Big Blue, and the Neosho, and from all your plains and valleys.

I seem not to have journeyed hither, but to have floated across the sea,—the prairie sea,—under bright autumnal skies, wafted by genial breezes into the havens where I wished to be. I am not sorry that my visit has occurred at this particular time, so sad in its influence, when nature, that sends its rains upon the unjust as well as the just, has for a year withdrawn its genial showers from the soil of Kansas. It is well to see one's friends in darkness and sadness, as well as in the hour of joy.

I have beheld the scenes of your former conflicts. I have also looked upon that beautiful eminence on the banks of the Kansas river, where Lecompton sits a lonely widow, [cheers and laughter,] desolate and mourning, her ambitious structures showing how high is the ambition of Slavery, and their desolation showing how easy, after all, is her downfall. I would have seen more of Kansas, if I had not been interrupted and impeded in my course through the State by the hospitality and kindness of the people, which I could not turn aside. I have been excessively retentive at Leavenworth and Topeka, refusing to open my lips, unless my jaws were pried open, because I do not like to say things by piecemeal.

I desire to speak openly to you, in the broad daylight, in the hearing of the women as well as men of Kansas; and here, where I have renewed the memories of the contest waged upon this soil, while I see around me the broken implements with which that contest was waged by the aggressors under the plea of popular sovereignty, which left the people perfectly free to do just as they please, subject to the Constitution of the United States, which they were left perfectly free to interpret as they pleased, while the authorities at Washington have never been able to interpret it.

When I look at field after field, and cabin after cabin, and church after church, and school house after school house, where but six years ago was the unbroken range of savages, I am prepared here—not expecting to escape being heard on the Pacific as well as the Atlantic coast—I am prepared to declare, and do declare you people of Kansas, the most intelligent, and the bravest and most virtuous people of the United States. [Applause.] That is the most intelligent, and

bravest and most virtuous people, which can take the banner of Human Freedom when it is trailed in the dust by the government of its choice, and can and does raise it aloft and protect it, and bear it to success and honor—and that without bloodshed and violence.

People of Kansas! you are at once the youngest, the newest people—the newest State, as well as the youngest of all the thirty-four American States; you are the poorest in wealth, the least favored with political power, for you are nearly disfranchised—and yet you are the most inflexible, and the most constant. The two richest States in the Union are Massachusetts and New York, but they are so merely because they are the freest, the wisest, and the most liberty-loving States of the Union. I apprehend that you scarcely understand yourselves the importance of the position which you hold in this Republic. You will perhaps be surprised, when I tell you that the secret of all the interest I have felt in you has been merely this: that you occupy a pivotal position in the Republic of the United States, with regard to Slavery and Freedom. There is no contest, no difference on this subject, along the line of the Northeastern States, for they are hostile to Slavery. There is no difference on the line of the Southern States, for they are in favor of Slavery. But there has been a severe strife between Freedom and Slavery, for the establishment of Freedom or Slavery, in all the wide region reaching from the Missouri to the Pacific Ocean. If Freedom was to triumph in this contest, there was no point where she could expect to meet the enemy, except on the very place she has met it—here. And if you had been false, Slavery would have swept along through the Indian Territory, Texas, and the whole of the country, including the Rocky Mountains, to the Pacific Ocean.

California was imperfectly secured to Freedom, and with a compromise. You opened a new campaign here, to reclaim what was given up in that already broken compromise, and it has been crowned with a complete victory. Henceforth, the battle is ended; henceforth, the emigrant from the Eastern States, from Germany and Ireland, the free laborer, in short, from every land on the earth, when he reaches the Missouri river, will enter on a broad land of impartial liberty.

He can safely pursue his way under the banner of Freedom to the foot of the Rocky Mountains; and there the hosts of freemen from the western coast will unite and join under the same banner, extending North and South. Everywhere, except in Missouri, is a land of Freedom. Missouri stands an island of Slavery in the midst of a broad ocean of Liberty. You occupy not only the pivotal position, but it was your fortune to attempt this great enterprise in behalf of Freedom at a critical period for mankind. Slavery was then just 200 years old, in the United States. In the year 1776, our fathers gave battle to Slavery; they declared war against it, and pledged their lives and sacred honor, in the service against it. Practically, it was to be destroyed peaceably, under the Constitution of the United States. Those good men believed it would reach its end long before this period; but the people became demoralized. The war went back, *back*, BACK, until 1854—until all guaranties of Freedom, in every part of the United States were abandoned, and Kansas, that had for forty years been perfectly free from the footsteps of the slave, was pronounced by the highest power of the Government as much a Slave State as South Carolina. The flag of the United States was made the harbinger, not of Freedom, but of Human Bondage.

It was at this crisis that the people of Kansas appeared on the stage, reviled and despised, and lifted the banner of Liberty on high, and bore it manfully forward, defied all force, and yet counteracted peaceably all the efforts made to subdue them. In three years they not only secured Freedom in Kansas, but in all the Territory of the United States.

Freedom made Kansas as free as Massachusetts, and made the Federal Government, on and after the 4th of March next, the patron of Freedom—what it was at the beginning. You have made Freedom national, and Slavery sectional. Had you receded after your first conditional or provisional Government was dispersed at Topeka, by cannon and bayonet; had you surrendered and accepted the Lecompton Constitution; had you even abandoned the Wyandott Constitution, at any stage of the battle, it would have destroyed the cause of Freedom, not only in Kansas, but also throughout the whole Union.

I know I shall be justified in history; shall I not be justified by cotemporaries? Wise, best, bravest of citizens; no other hundred thousand people in the United States have contributed as much for the cause of Freedom, as Kansas. Before this people, then, appearing for the first time, I bow myself, as I have never done before to any other people, in profound reverence. [Sensation.] I salute you with gratitude and affection.

Fellow citizens, my time here, as well as yours, is brief. It is but few of many subjects upon which we can even touch. As to the least important subject of all, myself, I give you, in one word, my sincere and heartfelt thanks. I had formed my opinion of you from your past conduct and history. I have not been disappointed in your kindness. For all that remains to me, give yourselves no trouble. Freedom is saved and assured to California and Kansas, and therefore assured to the future states in the Rocky Mountains. If I may, indeed, hope that my poor name will find a place in the history of California and Kansas, then all the ambition I have ever cherished is more than abundantly satisfied.

The second consideration to which I would advert for a moment, is this sadness which lies like a pall over a large part of the Territory of Kansas—the result of the withdrawal of the rain for a period so long as to excite apprehensions of a famine.

I have carefully examined the condition of Kansas—the river bottoms and the prairies, and my conclusion is—not more from the condition of the crops, than from the character of the people—that there will be no famine in Kansas, because there is wealth and credit enough in Kansas to carry you through more than one year like this. You will take care of this credit, and retain it, so far as possible. If this will not do, then appeal to your friends in the East, and they will not see you suffer. I myself will do what I can for you. Be of good cheer. Suffer yourselves not to be discouraged. There are cattle

enough on your thousand hills, if sold—although it is a fearful sacrifice—to carry you through and sustain you during the winter, and still come out in the spring with milch cows and working oxen. And we who are here—coming from States whence emigration flows, and from the Atlantic States, where emigration is received and sent onward—will all do our share to direct emigration to Kansas, assuring them from our own observation that it is a climate as salubrious as any in the world, and a soil as rich as any the sun ever shone upon. This is a smiling and fair dominion, and we think, were we set back twenty or thirty years, the place of all others that we would seek in the United States would be the plains of Kansas. [Applause.]

One other consideration. When we see before us the transactions of this day, do they not illustrate the subject of the "irrepressible conflict?" [Cheers and laughter.] Did not our forefathers, in 1787, settle this whole question, and, by an ordinance, put at rest forever the question of Freedom and Slavery in the United States? Certainly they did. Did they not, in 1820, settle this conflict forever? Did they not declare that all north of 36 deg. 30 lat., and west of the Missouri river should be given up to Freedom? Certainly they did. Was it not settled finally a third time in 1850, when Kansas and Nebraska were still saved to Freedom, and all lying west of them? Was it not settled a f urth time in 1854, when it was ordained that the people of Kansas were free to choose Freedom or Slavery for themselves, subject to the Constitution of the United States? Was it not settled for the fifth time, when the Lecompton Constitution was adopted by one scratch of the pen of the President of the United States and the Supreme Court—and this became a land of Slavery?

A Voice: We did not take that government.

Mr. Seward: You didn't take it—that is just what I was going to say.

Why was not Slavery *settled* by all these settlements? For no other reason than because the conflict was irrepressible. But you determined, in your struggle for Kansas, that she shall be forever free; and that settles the question.

A Voice: It is not settled yet. There's New Mexico.

Mr. Seward: My friend tells me it is not settled yet, but it is settled in Kansas and for Kansas. In New Mexico they tried to settle it in favor of Slavery, but they now find out it is irrepressible there. I think you will find that the whole battle was settled to the deliverance of Kansas, and that henceforth Freedom will be triumphant in all the Territories of the United States.

And yet, while this is clear to these intelligent, practical and sensible men who have gone through the problem, what a contrast is seen here to what is occurring in other parts of the United States, where they suppose, because they are older, they are so much wiser; where they believe me still as false a prophet as Mohammed. In Pennsylvania they have not yet made up their minds that there is any conflict at all, much less that it is irrepressible. In the Southern States they are actually organising a militia against the freemen who are establishing Freedom in Kansas and New Mexico, as if the settlers in Kansas were no wiser than they are, and would seek to propagate Freedom by the sword. When freemen want to make a Territory free, they give it ballot boxes, and schoolhouses and churches; and Slavery will never triumph where these are first established.

But to go a little deeper into the subject. In 1776 and 1787, there were wise men administering the Government of the United States; and if you look into their sayings, you will see they had all found out that this Republic was to be the home of an ever-increasing people, so free, so proud, so wise, so vigorous, that they could not be confined in the old thirteen States; they saw that this Republic was to be the home of free men, of free labor, and not slave labor. So, they set apart all the Territory within their reach, *i. e.*, all they then had control over—for Freedom and for free emigration. Now, contrast that which was wisely done in 1787 with what actually happened in 1850! In 1820 it was found that the population of the United States had crossed the Mississippi. Then what was necessary was, to provide exactly the same kind of government for the Territory west of the Mississippi, as had been provided for the country east of it; so that, when the government should be extended to the Pacific, all should be free. Could anything have been wiser than for Government in 1850 to have given Freedom to these Territories? But it did not. They had previously given Missouri to Slavery, and said Freedom might take the rest; but now they wished to block up free labor by the barrier of slave Missouri. Could anything have been more absurd than to thus attempt to stay the course of freemen? Either free labor must go out of the United States, or it must go round Missouri to Kansas and New Mexico. It did go round for a short season, but then it broke their barriers, and passed through the very garrison of the slave power.

There were long ago good and brave men who foretold this result. There was John Quincy Adams, who remonstrated against the extension of Slavery as political suicide.

There were Henry W. Taylor, James Tallmadge, and peerless among them all, Rufus King, who declared in the Senate of the United States, that the Slave Power in Missouri would prove a mockery; that this land was for liberty; and that the Slave Power would repent in sackcloth and ashes. But these good men were overruled. Missouri and Arkansas came into the Union with Slavery. And for what reason? It was because the slaveholders had property—capital which must not be confiscated, even to prevent Slavery from being established over as large a domain as half of Europe. This was the reason the Federal Government determined to secure their slaves to the capitalists of Missouri. What capital had Missouri in slaves that was saved at that time? All the slaves in Missouri at that time, were exactly 10,220 in number—and I was born a slaveholder, and know something of the value of slaves, at that time three hundred dollars a head, including the old and young, the sick and decrepid, which made the total value of the slaves in Missouri, in 1820, $3,066,000. Arkansas then had 1,600 slaves, worth $480,000. The whole capital of slaves in Missouri and Arkansas was about $3,500,000, but to save that capital in negroes, the great compromise of 1850 was made, and Kansas

given up to Slavery. Three million five hundred thousand dollars was a large sum, but nobody then or ever proposed to confiscate it. They were left free to sell their slaves; they were at liberty to keep them, so only that they should import no more. There was no need of confiscating the slaves in Missouri any more than there was in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, so this $3,500,000 was never in jeopardy.

Now then, fellow citizens, even if it had been confiscated, how small a sacrifice of property it was, weighed against the incalculable blessing of Freedom over the American continent. Look now at the advantages of their success, and see how unavailing are the contrivances of politicians, and even of nations, to counteract and control the great moving principle of the age. Who would have thought, and who now, of the wisest men in the Slave States and many from the other States, can believe that by making Missouri a Slave State in 1820, forty years afterwards, when the canals of New York and Pennsylvania were burdened with commerce, when steamers dotted all our inland lakes and rivers, when teachers and preachers were abroad through the land, that they could make a Slave State out of Kansas? They tried it, and what have they got? They have got Slavery in Missouri and Arkansas; Freedom in Kansas, and practically in New Mexico, in Utah and California. That is what comes from attempting to bind up the decrees of Providence in flaxen bands by human skill. [Applause.] Why did their attempt fail? It failed because society has its rights and its necessities. It was just as necessary that men should move out of Massachusetts and New York and the Western States, and Missouri even, into the Territories, as it is necessary that Kansas and other Territories should receive them when they have come. It was just as necessary that the exile of Europe should have a place where he was perfectly free to have no slaves. The movement of the age is quickened by the agency of mind and of inventions; all the operations of trade, the arts and manufactures, are accelerated by mechanical skill. Who thinks now of drawing himself to town with a pair of mules? The steam engine carries him there with less cost than he could walk or go on wagons. All the implements with which work and husbandry are done, are the product of mechanical skill. Every farmer sees that by the improvements made in the implements for cultivating the soil, every year he is able to dispense with the services of one more laborer, who becomes himself an independent farmer.

Europe has been in a state of commotion for more than sixty years, and still is. Ireland was bound to seek relief; Germany was over populated, and must have an outlet for her energy and labor. What madness and folly, then, that the statesmen of 1820 should open this country to Slavery, and instead of securing it teeming with wealth and abundant cultivation, have it abandoned to the product of negroes at $1,500 a head! [Laughter.] It is because I speak so plainly of these things that some believe me not a very conservative man.

I think you are wiser than your fathers, wherever you may have come from. I had a father who was a very wise man, but I think I should be unworthy of him, had I not sought to improve my better opportunities to become a wiser man than he. It would have been much better for Missouri and Arkansas could they have foreseen the consequence of their action. The consequence of their embracing Slavery is that the tide of emigration in 1820, which would naturally have come up the Mississippi river was driven round into other regions. Instead of entering at New Orleans, it sought the ports of New York and Quebec, peopled the Provinces of Canada and the line of the Northern Lakes. There are three millions of settlers in the Provinces which Slavery in Missouri sent round there. This same tide of emigration peopled Northern Ohio, Wisconsin and Michigan, and thence passed west to Iowa, Nebraska and Kansas. Missouri has thus lost from her soil all this population. At last the mass of emigration got to be so dense that it could not divide and spread itself, so making a great rush, it swept through Missouri, through the very strongholds of Slavery. There is not within the longitude of my voice probably one man, if Missouri had been wise, and had not driven emigration from its natural course, that would ever have set foot on the soil of Kansas. There is population enough in Kansas now to make Missouri a great State. But Missouri does not want to be a great State. She prefers to wait and be a Slave State. [Laughter.] She has no affection for the people of the North, but a great affection for the people of the South. She has no affection for free labor, but a great affection for slave labor. She has no free speech; she is satisfied to have what she may say, or may not, controlled by the Slave Power. This is a sad case for Missouri, but not hopeless. She must look for deliverance to Kansas, which Missouri at first overrun and subjugated, and which Missouri refused to let come into the Union, but which is drawing emigration through Missouri, and opening the way, and marking out the very course, and inviting Missouri on, and calling upon Eastern capitalists to open a national highway to Pike's Peak and California. Missouri to-day is richer by millions on millions by the settlement of Kansas by free men. All her hopes of competition with the free Northern States are based upon what you are doing, and can do, and will do, to make a Pacific railroad through to the Pacific ocean.

Never was policy of any State more suicidal; for either she is to be forever a slave State, as she desires to be, or she had better have been free from the beginning. If she is a Slave State, she must be a planting State merely, and the value of her land would be nearly worthless—for on an average the value of land in a free State is exactly three-fold the value of land in a slave State. Then, if Missouri wants to be a Slave State, the wisest thing she can do is to do on the west what she has done on the east—*i. e.*, to consent to be surrounded with free, prosperous States.

These free States which you are building in Kansas and Nebraska, are showing and opening the true national highway to the Pacific Ocean. You are producing around Missouri the influences which they dread, and call abolitionising. I don't know any way in which such an operation can be done with so much quietness, as to go round her, and leave her to abolitionise herself. She will do it, too, because Missouri has got capital, and she will find out that if she is a slave State and Kansas free, Kansas, in twenty years,

will send more members to Congress than Missouri—and people, though slaveholders don't like to give up political power.

Another lesson which this occasion teaches us, is instructive in an eminent degree. When Missouri, in 1820, compelled Congress to admit her as a slave State, and in 1854 to abrogate the Missouri Compromise, and in 1856 drove all freemen from Kansas, in order to have Slavery in Kansas, she did not see how futile would be her efforts. Missouri obtained these concessions for Slavery from the General Government, not because the people of the United States love Slavery, but because they love the Union.

But all the efforts of the slave power were defeated by bands of emigrants from New England, from New York and other Eastern States, from Germany and Ireland—who came up the Missouri river, fearless of cannons, and found the slaveholders here armed; and they drove them out of the Territory, and established what is called an "Abolition" Territory—making it a place for connection by the "Underground Rail Road" with every State. Who would have believed that this could have been done, and that we should have met here to-day to celebrate it with all kinds of demonstrations—by the firing of cannon, by dinners and balls—and the Union be just as safe now as it was before? [Cheers.]

Another consideration. It is not our choice, fellow citizens, that our lot as a people is cast upon a continent, and that we are so constituted that in spite of ourselves we must become, sooner or later, the possessors of the whole continent of North America, from Hudson's Bay to the Gulf of Mexico, from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast. France and Spain and Great Britain, who formerly occupied vast possessions on this continent, have been gradually giving way, retiring. Every year they are weaker, and it is only a question of fifty or one hundred years, before we shall be masters of the American Confederacy or Republic, over all this.

Now, a government which is to be extended over a continent needs wealth; it needs riches. A great government needs wealth in proportion to its extent; its people must have wealth as an element of their happiness and prosperity. It is utterly contemptible and ridiculous to say, that the continent of North America, instead of being peopled by free men, who are willing to take it at forty acres apiece and enrich it,—instead of this, to turn off all these free laborers, and get slaves from Africa at two hundred dollars a head. What wealth have they in the Slave States? I much mistake if the people of Kansas would, ten years hence, exchange their wealth for that of the Old Dominion—slaves included.

Great nations require something more than wealth; they need intelligence, vigor and energy among the people. You are to-day planted here, where, if, as they apprehend, the slaves become discontented, and the people of the slave States are to be protected, you are the very men upon whom they must rely for that protection; you are the men to defend them; you must also raise the means to defend the national flag upon every sea, and over all this continent. Give men freedom; then every freeman will give you a return—an equivalent for it; deny them that, and every man becomes an alien, an enemy, under the Government. You remember how feeble and defenceless we Free State men were ten years ago: you see now that we are established in Kansas—upon the Pacific ocean in the centre of the continent, and we might almost say that—

"We are monarchs of all we survey."

This success, this power, has been obtained—how? It has been obtained amid reproach, invective, against force, fraud, and the power of the Federal Government. This success will soon be made still more apparent by the election of Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency. [Cheers.] And this victory has been built upon nothing except those smooth, round pebbles with which we laid the foundations—and the storms of earth and hell shall not prevail against it.

It reminds me of that beautiful island of Capri, on which the rocks are piled in native deformity, but in native strength, upon whose summits I found the ruins of the palaces of Domitian and Nero. Yet when I entered a cavern on the shore, I found that the whole Island rested on a foundation of coral.

These are the considerations which present themselves to me on coming among you. I have kept nothing back. Henceforth, if my confidence in the stability of the American Union wavers, I shall come here to learn that the Union is stronger than human ambition, because it is founded in the affection of the American people. If ever I shall waver in my affection for Freedom, I shall come up here and renew it—here under the inspiration of one hundred thousand freemen, saved from Slavery. Henceforth, these shall not be my sentiments alone, but the sentiments of ALL. Men will come up to Kansas as they go up to Jerusalem. This shall be a sacred city.

For my brethren and companions' sake, then, I say—Peace be within your walls, and plenteousness in all your cabins, soon to become palaces. And now, people of Kansas, once more HAIL! and at the same time, Farewell.

[Three most enthusiastic cheers were then given by all the assembled multitude for Gov. Seward.]

SPEECH

OF

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

AT SENECA FALLS, OCT. 31, 1860.

Fellow Citizens—A crisis in individual life is when a man passes safely through some perilous accident, or surmounts some apprehended mortal disease; or else when he falls before the danger, or succumbs to the disease and dies. A political crisis, such as we so often hear of, is the period in which a nation—for a nation is but a person, a human person consisting of many persons—surmounts some national disease or avoids some national peril, and takes new assurance and long life, or failing to surmount it, suddenly or slowly languishes and dies. And politicians, availing themselves through the influence of interest or passion, tell us very often that the town in which we live, or the state in which we belong, or the country of which we are members, is in a crisis, misjudging, because a crisis occurs but seldom even in the course of individual life, and at very distant periods in the life of a nation But on all hands there is an agreement now that this Republic of ours is in a crisis, and I, for one, confess as I believe it to be true, if this Republic passes safely through this crisis, it takes assurance of long endurance—practically of immortality; and if it fails to pass safely through this crisis, it will languish and die. To know how to pass safely through a crisis, it is necessary to understand its nature, and to understand the nature of the present national crisis it will be necessary for us to go back to the beginning.

I said we must go back to the beginning, and the moment that we go back to the beginning of our national existence we perceive the fact, clear, unmistakable and uncontested, that this nation was to be, not a monarchy, not an aristocracy, but a Republican nation. That can be a Republican nation only which is a free nation; and if freedom or liberty is a vital principle of every Republican Government, or every Republican State, that principle is that the people must be free and must be equal. When we say that the people of a country are free and equal, we say precisely that that nation enjoys civil and religious liberty, and that all, practically all, of its citizens enjoy the rights and safety of their persons, of freedom in the pursuit of happiness, which involves freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of suffrage, and above all freedom of religious conscience.

This you will all recognize, at once, as the nature of the Republic which our fathers intended to establish, and which we all confess, and the world confesses, that they did establish. It did mean that every human being within the jurisdiction of the government when it was first established, was, or must immediately be entirely free. That was impossible because slaves and slavery existed in the land at that time, and there was no process by which every human being in the United States, on the first organization of the government, could be emancipated, if in bondage, and raised up to freedom; but it did mean this,—that the great mass of the people were, and should remain, forever free—that slavery should be subordinate, inferior in its position to freedom, and that freedom should be the general and normal condition of the country—that there, after all the changes, shall be, not from freedom towards slavery, but from existing and tolerated slavery, upward toward freedom. This was all that could have been done in the country, at that time, and this country was in a better condition to establish a free government, than any other people that had then existed on the face of the globe.

I call your attention, then, to this fact, that there were thirteen of those States—that this was not to be a consolidated nation, consisting of only one people, and one jurisdiction alone, like France, or like Russia, but that it did consist of thirteen equal States, and that in these States were to remain thereafter, and until the end of time; and each of them should be, in a large degree, sovereign States—and all of them,

of course, should be equal. That this was to be in the beginning a Republic of thirteen States, and that, as time should advance, the number should increase to twenty, up to thirty—at which standard we have already arrived—and in distant years forty, fifty, or sixty States—a thing not impossible, scarcely improbable, for many to see who are not older than the lad who sits upon the stage before me.

Now none of these States, practically none, with the exception of Massachusetts, scarcely worth noticing,—no one of these States had an entire population of freemen. There were Slaves in every State, and Slavery was commingled with freemen in each one, and through the whole country. But, nevertheless, freedom was recognized, and not Slavery, in founding the Federal Government, as the element which prevailed in every one of these thirteen States; and what was to be done was, to take care that freedom, and not Slavery, should predominate in all the other States, which, under any circumstances, and at any period, however remote, might be adopted into the Union.

There was, as you see, Slavery existing then in every State in the newly formed Union—and there was freedom existing in it, and these two were in conflict. Let the silly person who denies that there is a conflict between freedom and slavery wherever they exist in the country, and that that conflict is irrepressible, answer me. [Tremendous cheering.] Let him answer me, whether taking the Declaration of Independence, which was the first utterance of the American Nation, he does not read there in the very first sentence of that utterance the existence of a conflict between Freedom and Slavery?

He certainly will read there the declaration that "all men are created equal and have inalienable rights to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Did they assert a mere truism which all the world accepted and upon which all the world have based all their institutions, or did they assert a truth that other people beside the American nation, denied and rejected. They asserted a truth which only this nation, and none before this had ever asserted, and which was disputed in this country at the time, and was in dispute, and is in dispute still, over the whole face of the globe.

Let me ask the silly person who denies that there is an irrepressible conflict between Freedom and Slavery, whether every page of the history of the United States does not bear testimony to the conflict between Freedom and Slavery for the period of eighty years that this Union has endured? What else have we had from the beginning, but attempts to compromise—compromises and breaches of compromises of the dispute between Freedom and Slavery—and if it was so in the beginning and has been so through the middle, how is it now? Upon what issue is the American people divided in this political crisis, except a conflict between Freedom and Slavery? So, fellow-citizens, unless this conflict shall end in the manner appointed by Him who created and called into existence all nations, as he did all men, and that is in favor of the right, so it will be an irrepressible conflict until this nation shall cease to exist, and shall give place to some other in which the same conflict shall be renewed.

There was then a conflict between Freedom and Slavery in the beginning, and our fathers had to choose between Freedom and Slavery as the elemental and vital principle of the Republic. Our fathers, differing from their descendants, widely differing from you, strange that it should be so, were unanimous in accepting and adopting Freedom and rejecting Slavery as the elemental and vital principle of the Republic. And not one statesman of them all proposed at any time that all the American States, all of which practically were then slaveholding States, should continue and remain forever slaveholding States, and that every new State which should come into the Union through the course of ages, should also be a Slave State. If there was one such statesman in any one of those thirteen Slave Stanes, pray name him to me, because his name and action have escaped my reading of history. Not one statesman of the Republic proposed an equilibrium or a balance, in which Freedom should be one principle and Slavery another, in the United States. That is to say, that one half of the States should be Free States and that the other half of the States should be Slave States, and that each should remain free or slave through all time as they were at the beginning, and that the future States one half to be admitted to be free and the other half to be slave, and they should remain so forever. If I am mistaken in this, if there was any statesman of that day who proposed an equal balance between Freedom and Slavery, I pray you to name him to me, because his name has escaped my reading of history. Not one statesman in any part of this Republic proposed to leave the matter to accident or choice, to let Freedom and Slavery balance each other, or the one to prevail over the other, as it might, careless whether Freedom was voted up or voted down, whether Slavery was voted up or voted down. Many of you are committed to a theory something like this last, and to a candidate who avows it for a sovereign remedy to a great national disease. They must have consulted the science and the history of the science of politics in the country! If there is one of these political philosophers proposing the theory of indifference or practicing it, I pray you to name him to me, because I have been unable to find it inscribed upon the history of the fathers of the Republic.

Now, fellow-citizens, there was a way in which this Union could have been established upon either of these three principles. There was a way in which this could have been made a Republic, not of Freedom, but of Slavery. And if there had been statesmen who desired such a Government, the process would have suggested itself to them, it is very simple, and they would have propounded it to the Convention which formed and to the people who accepted our State and Federal Constitution; and it was this:—Prohibit emancipation in all the thirteen States; prohibit emigration of foreigners from all countries into the United States, or any of them, because foreigners were free men; deny naturalization to the foreigner who is found here and leave him practically disfranchised, and therefore in the class of slaves; [an enthusiastic Irishman in the crowd proposed three groans for Fillmore;] perpetuate the African Slave Trade, so that for all time to come the future inhabitants of the United States, upon whom they

must depend for labor and for the great business of society, should be African slaves; declare Slavery to be not only existing and the law of the land in each State, but declare that it shall be perpetual. Declare this and take one step more. Let the Federal Government, the Congress of the United States, shut up the common domain upon which the future States were to be created, that domain stretching between the River Ohio and the great Lakes to the Mississippi; declare that that domain shall be open hereafter, not to Freemen at all, but only to Slaveholders and Slavery.

Now you see how easy it would have been at that day, by adopting this simple programme, to have made not the Free Republic which our fathers bequeathed to us, but a Slave Republic, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mississippi river, and from the St Lawrence to the St Mary's, which were the original boundaries of the Republic.

There was a way also for the statesmen of that day, if that had been what they desired and what they meant, to make a Republic in which Freedom and Slavery should be held in equilibrium and remain so forever. How was this to be done? Divide the thirteen States so that in just one half of the territory on which Freedom should exist and Slavery be unknown, and in the other half Slavery should exist and Freedom be unknown. Admit, of all the future States, just one half Free and the other half Slave; open your ports to the emigrant from Ireland, Scotland, England, France Germany, Holland and Switzerland; admit just one-half of white labor of the country free, keep open the African Slave trade and admit and receive the other half of the labor of African Slaves—here you would have had that perfect equilibrium between Freedom and Slavery which those who oppose the Republican party say is exactly the condition in which the country can live and flourish, and to which they propose to bring it by the policy upon which they insist.

There was a way also for a third system to be established—the don't know and don't care system—that is, that it shall be a Republic of Freedom or Slavery, just as time and chance and accident shall determine. How was that to be done? Why, if there had been any statesman of the order of Mr. Douglas at that time, he would have taken great care that the Congress of the United States should have no power to abolish the African Slave Trade, but it should have power to admit at the same time foreign emigrants and naturalize them, and that Congress should be pledged by the Constitution to admit a State, slave or free, just as it should come when it offered itself, without resistance, and he would have taken good care to have the Supreme Court bound up so it should not interfere with the question, and when that was done and when that course had been adopted, then the slaveholders would have been invited to carry as many slaves into the Territories—new territories—as they could, and the foreign laborers, to go in as freely as they could, and as soon as they got into the Territory begin to vote it up or vote it down, or vote both ways as they chose; and when they were to vote it up or down then invite the slaveholders of other States to interfere on the side of Slavery, and then, failing to be able to settle it at the ballot box, just resort to cannon and rifle, and what they could not vote up or vote down, they would fight up or fight down.

It is not needful, fellow-citizens, for me to say that such a republic as would have been admitted upon either of these three principles could not have existed seventy years. It is not necessary to prove that it could not, and therefore I pass it by, although it is my own opinion that a Republican Government that can stand at all, must stand upon the principle of Liberty paramount to Slavery. The people of the country, then, having these three systems before them, adopted one entirely different from them all, and that was the principle of making freedom paramount in the Federal Government, everywhere, so far as they could, to the principle of Slavery. We have grown to our present growth upon this principle, and it has become the fixed and settled habit of our national life,—we live hereafter if we continue in the habit of preserving freedom of labor paramount to Slavery, and we perish whenever we change that habit;—for it is with nations as it is with individuals—the nation that forsakes and abandons the habit of health which is essential in its very constitution, declines and perishes as the consequence at the departure. How was this principle of Freedom paramount to Slavery established? The fathers encouraged every one of the thirteen original Slave States to emancipate their slaves just so soon as they could consistently with the interest and the comfort of society then existing. It proposed to nobody to abolish Slavery all at once, to substitute Freedom all at once; it is neither the course of nature nor the course of human wisdom to do anything of a sudden; but time enters and is an essential element in all human transactions which are wise. Then they prohibited the African Slave trade, not all at once, because that might produce a shock if suddenly done. But they prohibited it after twenty years, and said to the slaveholders and those in the slaveholding interest, "make good use of your time, twenty years you may import the black bondman into the country and hold him there, but after that period, there shall never be another slave imported into this Union, whether its institutions be free or slave institutions" They took one further step, and that is, they invited the foreigners of all lands, the free men of all lands, of all conditions and all climates, into the country to fill up the vacuum or void which was to be made by preventing the importation of slaves, and declared that on giving evidence of character and loyalty, they should all become citizens of the United States equal with the native; aye, even with the first born of the Republic. They took one further step, and that was, to make all the future States that should be admitted into the Union become not Slave but Free States, by just building a wall along the bank of the Ohio river, where all these new States were to be erected, and said, this shall be Free Soil, and it shall never be trodden by the foot of the Slave, and every State that shall be erected here shall not be a Slave but a Free State.

Having just accepted these few simple measures, the Fathers sat themselves down contentedly and said to themselves: "It has been well and wisely done. True, we have not all Free States and universal freedom, and for the present we have more Slave States than Free; but

we have so arranged the forces of Freedom and Slavery in the balance that in sixty years there will be more Free States than Slave States; in eighty years there will be twice as many Free States as Slave States, and in one hundred years there will scarcely be a Slave State; and at some period, within a hundred or five hundred or a thousand years, every man under the government of the United States will be a freeman and Slavery anywhere will exist only as a relic of barbarism and inhumanity." Does any man deny now that this was well and wisely done? If he does, then he must wish that it had never been done—he must wish that this wise and judicious arrangement had never been made. Let us see, then, what would have been the consequence. Take a single State. If this arrangement which I have related to you, had not been made, this State of New York, which, in the beginning, when the system was adopted, of which every seventeenth was a slave, would have been a Slave State now. Does any man living in this State or out of it, in any Slave State, in any foreign country, is there a man who so hates the State of New York, and so much hates the human race, that he would be willing to have this not as it is now, a Free State, but a Slave State? There is not one wheel on this river that would be in motion if this were a Slave State; there is not one mine of salt or iron, —and we are not wealthy in mineral resources, —that would not have closed up. The city of New York, a metropolis worthy of a great State, a metropolis worthy of a great nation, a metropolis worthy of a great continent, rapidly advancing to be the first and greatest city of modern times, and first, therefore and greatest, of all the cities that ever existed in the great tide of time,—what would it have been now if this had been left to be a Slave State instead of a Free State? Strange inconsistency! You are all contented. Everybody is contented with Society as they find it in the State of New York. We could not be changed backward for anything, We must be free. But if there any who think this condition is confined to the State of New York, go, then, through Pennsylvania, New Jersey Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts Vermont, New Hampshire, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Iowa, and even Kansas, after the controversy is ended, and I ask where is the human being on the face of this earth, that is so hateful of human happiness, so hateful of the good and welfare of his country and of his race, that he would be willing to have Freedom excluded from that State, and Slavery introduced in its place.

Suppose for a moment, that in this State, instead of adopting the policy of the Fathers, making this free, and seeking to make all the other States free within the range of its Constitutional powers,—suppose it had been a Slave State what kind of freedom would the freemen in it enjoy? What would they be enjoying today? Not freedom of speaking just what they think or writing just what they think, or thinking just as they please, of worshipping God in every form, with every ritual that suits their own conscience; but they would have liberty to write, to speak, to think, to vote, to pray just exactly what the slaveholders desire them to write, speak, print, vote, and pray. [Cheers.] Is any body then discontented or dissatisfied with the existing condition of things in the country? Not a man. Everybody is satisfied that it was rightly and wisely ordered in the beginning. If there be anybody who is discontented, I pray him to speak. Is this country all too free for you? Is there any danger of its ever going to be so much more free as to be too free for you? Is the Republic already too great for you, and you would have it less, or contract it in its dimensions? [Cries of no! no!] Is the Republic too rich, too prosperous, our people too happy for you? Its commerce, the second of any nation in the whole world, is it too broad, is it too enriching, is it too refining, that you would have it reduced? Not at all. [Voice—"We'll never have it reduced." Laughter.] Shall the influence of this nation be broken up, and aristocratic and despotic systems extended over the whole world? Do you dislike this, would you have this a miserable slave Republic which would be mentioned in the councils of Kings and Emperors and the conclaves of aristocrats not with respect, and honor, and fear, as it is now, but with scorn, contempt and reproach? No! No! There is nobody wants the country less prosperous, less great, less free, less powerful than it is now.

But, fellow citizens, going on just exactly in the track which was laid out for it by the Fathers it is going to be so much greater than it is now, so much broader, so much wiser and happier, aye, and even so much more free that those who come fifty years after us, will wonder at our contentment with being satisfied with such a country as we then had. Now, does anybody want to arrest it? The way that all this is to happen is by multiplying the Free States in the west, and taking care, as fast as possible, to see that Slavery is reduced and diminished in the old States, not by any force that anybody is to apply, for there never was force contemplated nor used, but simply by teaching—by example that compensated labor is more productive of wealth and happiness in a society, than slave labor, that morality is better than crime, and humanity is better than inhumanity, and that virtue is the surest and safest guide to national prosperity and greatness. But if anybody does want anywhere to arrest the growing prosperity and greatness of the Republic, there is one simple way to do it. I can show him exactly how to do it. Encourage all the Slave States to continue and to perpetrate slavery forever, re open the African Slave trade, and open the public domain to Slave States instead of free, and the whole thing is done, secured to be done at least, in the twinkling of an eye. I am sure that you do not want such a sad perverseness to come over the people of this country as to produce such a shock and such a change. Rather with me you would continue contented and with the Fathers reducing and circumscribing Slavery just as they did, and as vigilantly as they did, and then wait to see Canada and all British America to the shores of Hudson Bay, and Russian America to Behrings Straits, and Spanish America to the Isthmus of Panama, and perhaps to Cape Horn, all coming in to this Republic as they would come, voluntarily, as they could not be kept from coming —it would require the sword to force it—if you would only admit them as equal states and carry to these the blessings of your free States, but not the curse of Slave States.

Well, fellow-citizens, it is said to confess that just what I have been stating to you as the great problem of our government, is the very question in this canvass. The question in this canvass is, whether we shall keep this nation a Republic of Freedom, or reverse all its policy and henceforth make it a Republic of Slavery. It were better if it were to be a Slave Republic, better that it were made so in the beginning, than that it should have been deferred to us to have committed such a crime against mankind, and change now from Freedom to Slavery. When the national pulse is healthiest, when the whole form of the nation is rounded out and full, and when its habit of existence is Freedom, to change that by injecting Slavery into into its veins, would be to smite it immediately with a poison under which it languish for a time, and dissolve and die. It could have been made a slave Republic in the beginning peacefully. It could be made a slave Republic now only by Revolution, resulting in civil war and anarchy.

But how does this question arise? It arises in this way. There is nobody discontented among us; but south of Mason and Dixon's line there is discontentment, and unhappiness, and despondency, and a feeling amounting almost to despair. South of the Delaware river, I should have said, are six States which, like the other seven, at the beginning were Slave States, which declined to take the advice and counsel of the Fathers, as the seven did, and kept and continued Slavery, and they retain it yet. They are discontented, they are unhappy. Have they suffered from this being made a Free Republic? If so, will any one here who sympathizes with them, and they have many of that class, will any one tell me what wrong, what injurious measure any one or all the Slave States in this Republic have ever suffered from the policy which has made this and kept this a Free Republic?

Have they not enjoyed Freedom? Have they not enjoyed the freedom of having Slavery, and has any one deprived them of the right, of the power? Has any one enjoined upon them, or enforced upon them, an unwilling duty? Not one. Have they been taxed oppressively? They have submitted to equal taxation, and no other can be enforced. Have they not enjoyed equal representation? Aye, a representation equal to those of the Free States, with the addition of two-thirds of all the slaves. They complain of no wrong, of no suffering that they have endured, and they could not complain, for they themselves have administered the government itself for the whole period of fifty years. They make no complaint against the government and its action, as they could not, because they were exercising the government, the Free States having resigned it to their hands in contentment. What then is the character and ground of their discontent? Nothing but this: that Slavery, confined to the natural increase of slave labor, and being by its nature inert and without vigor and force, that Slavery does not produce prosperity for them equal to the prosperity which free labor and Freedom produce for the States which abolished Slavery. This is the whole of all the complaint they have—that we of the Free States prosper more than they of the Slave States; they under the system of their choice, however and we under the system of our choice. They have still another complaint, and that is this: That Free States multiply so that where we had in the beginning only one Free State and they had the other twelve, they have now only fifteen Slave States and we have eighteen Free States, without counting the last and youngest one, which they still continue to deny to us.

This discontentment it is that works upon them to desire to produce a change. What is that change now which they desire and which they are seeking to produce, and can be produced only by our consent, and we can do nothing without taking their voice? It is to make no more Free States or to make less, or to reduce the number of Free States in the Republic by admitting hereafter Slave States, and enable them to provide the material for these Slave States by consenting to re-open the African Slave trade, and thereby reject the free and voluntary emigrant from Europe, excluding with him our own children from the common soil of the Republic.

And now I come to the question how it happens that we are in the crisis which I describe and confess. It is that for the sake of peace and harmony we have gone so far with them, conceded to their discontent so long that they have proceeded, in direct opposition to the action of all the social causes in the country. They have procured from the Congress of the United States laws, from the President of the United States judgments, which all lead directly to enable them, if we do not prevent the further passage of such laws, if we do not prevent the further issuing of such edicts, if we do not prevent the further registering of such decrees, to re-open the African Slave trade, and all the Territories which shall come in hereafter as States will be Slave Territory and not Free Territory, or at least so large a number of them as to subvert the balance of Freedom which has been established, and to introduce Slavery as an element in the Constitution of the Republic.

Now, fellow-citizens, I speak not unconscious of the place where I stand. I am surrounded by citizens of the county of Seneca. That one county, which has been known to me intimately for a long period, that one county lying between two beautiful lakes, transparent as crystal, with a soil as rich as ever the human hand subjected to supply the wants of man, a county in the very centre of Western New York which stood persistently,—I will not say obstinately—stood fixed in resisting and in dissenting from the people of all the counties of all the region around it, and maintaining continually, toleration not for Freedom but for Slavery, concession not to Freedom, but concession to Slavery, and for nearly forty years that I have known it, a balance of one or two hundred votes turned the scale, if ever it did turn, in favor of Freedom, (God be praised!) and the balance turned it nine-tenths of the time, I think in favor of human bondage. I know where I stand. I know where you stand. I know that this persistency in maintaining and defending Slavery here, while not you but your neighbors of Cayuga and Wayne, Ontario and Tompkins, and all the other people of this State, have arrested the footsteps of the invader of Slavery in Kansas, and turned him back.

I know you have not had this design—God knows there is no such perverseness among men that they can be insensible to the difference between right and wrong, justice and injustice,

liberty and slavery, humanity and cruelty. You have done it simply because you would not listen. You had your guides, grown up men as you are; from childhood up, you had your parties—your Whig party, and your American party, and your Democratic party. And they had their leaders, and you must take care of the welfare of your leaders. Must you? [Laughter.] You must see that they were sent to the legislature, and sent to Congress, sent to the public offices, and you had no time to listen to those who told you that the man that you call your leader is but the ephemeris of the day, that he perishes to-morrow, but Freedom or Slavery is the interest of humanity for all countries, for all ages. And you have gone on supporting, boasting that you are Old Line Whigs, until you have come to a pretty pass. [Laughter.] Where is your Old Line Whig party now? This irrepressible conflict that you condemn and despise has broken its back, [laughter] and its form divided, sunk into a hospitable grave.

You have supported Know Nothingism, and Americanism too, not because, I am sure, that you are so intolerant as the principles would indicate, but because it was a convenient dodge to escape from considering the question of Slavery. How much longer do you propose to support it? Do you expect that the time is coming soon when you can get the American people to proscribe a man because he was born in Ireland or Germany, who worships God with a ritual different from your own? My idea is that you have have tried that long enough, and found out that of all the contrivances in this world for the government of a people where universal suffrage exists, secrecy is the least hopeful. Now you have tried Democracy.—Haven't you tried that long enough? One would think so unless you are so wedded to it that you will adhere to it and perish in clinging to the dead body in the grave. Where is your Democratic party now? You had one a year ago, then six months ago you had two! [Laughter,] and now you have none at all. If you have got a Democratic party it has got a creed.—What is it? It is a creed adopted by a committee of merchants in New York, an eclectic creed, taking from the three creeds the whole—and nothing.

If you have got a Democratic party you have got a candidate for President. Who is it? Give me his name. [A voice, Breckenridge.] It is Breckenridge! how do you vote for him? By voting for Douglas? [Laughter.] You are mistaken. It was not Breckenridge, but Douglas. But if it is Douglas, how do you vote for him? By voting for John Bell? You may think there is no end to the self delusions which honest men may practice upon themselves. You may labor under the belief that you have a candidate, but the nearest approach to it is, that you have three. And of two of them, every Democrat must affirm that neither is a Democrat; while the men who vote for the third with you, affirm that your candidate is no Democrat. But you have three candidates.

Now, according to my poor judgment, and I am a simple man, I have been all my life, the world has said, in strange and erratic courses. The world has not agreed with me at all; and the common rule, and I think the true one, for ascertaining when a man is insane, is to enquire whether his judgment is opposed or not to the common judgment of all mankind; and if it is, you judge him to be insane. By this rule I have been held insane for a large portion of my life. But such as my judgment is, I give it to you—and that is, that the next thing for a party having no candidate, is to have three candidates, and to vote them all at once! [Tremendous applause.] I reason it out in this way:—That the Constitution will not allow you to have more than one, and if you do, you are voting for nobody—and that is just what you are doing. [Renewed applause.]

Now, I ask you, old line Whigs, and Native Americans, or Unionists, or whatever you call yourselves, and Democrats, whether you think this thing is going to hold out a great while? If you will take pains to take the record of the votes of the people of the free States—for now they are the controlling power on this subject—for the last twenty years, you will be able to mark off the cycles from one to two, and three, four, five, six, seven years, down to twenty, when at the beginning of that period an Abolitionist—as a free soil man or Republican was then called—was not to be found in a township, and you find that everywhere else in the State of New York, and in the free States, with the exception of a few cities, whose circumstances and condition make them such that they will come slower into these things, there stands out nobody in favor of these old tests but your county of Seneca. How long do you think you can stand it in this way? (A voice—"just one week.") I don't think so. I will suggest to you two reasons why it is not worth while to try. It is a fractional world we live in. It is better after you have made a complete and satisfactory trial, in finding that the whole world will not agree with you, that there is a comfort in giving up, and coming into an agreement with the whole world. And the second is that there is great discomfort in being pointed out by your children, and by your countrymen, as being singular, inconsistent, obstinate and perverse. And that is just what you are coming to. You don't know it, but every one of you, I might almost say, I have heard of your reproaching the "Old Fogies" of this land, haven't I? I have heard you reproach the old Federalists of this land, haven't I? I have heard you curse the memory of the Tories of this land, haven't I? Wherein does the old Fogy, the old Federalist, and the Tory, differ from the Democrats (so called) of Seneca County to-day? He differs not at all, in this, that he stood up for what his conscience told him was right, until the whole world judged that he ought to have surrendered his opinion to reason and to conviction. You think there was something very weak and absurd in old fogyism. There was nothing at all. It was an element of the Whig party. Its principle was, to insist upon a virtuous administration of the Government. It was right to be a Whig, and utterly absurd to be an old Fogy. What was Federalism? It was not vicious in itself. It was a principle of opinion, at a period when that principle was the saving principle of the country. It was virtuous, and right, and honorable among all men to be a Federalist, but it was a mighty mistake, when the controversy was all ended, to be an "old Federalist." And so to be a Tory was not to be a thing wrong in the beginning. For it was allegiance, the prin-

ciple of allegiance to the government of the country. And ten years before the Revolutionary war broke out, aye, five years, aye, on the day that it did break out, nine-tenths of the people of the United States were tories, less than than one-tenth of them Whigs of the Revolution. It was loyalty to the government. It was recognized as the true and rightful government of the country. It was right in the beginning to be a tory, but it was a very bad business in the end to stick to it after patriotism had given allegiance to the United States of America. Take care, then, that you don't believe that a name can save you. Neither of these names had as much sanctifying grace in them as this magic word Democracy has now. Take my word for it, in five years hence there will not be a man in this crowd that listens to me now, that will not regret that he did not change and go with the people of this country in saving themselves from a fatal calamity. Besides, it is a sad thing to think that we may live to be so old, and continue so perverse that we lose the sympathies of our neighbors, fellow-citizens and countrymen. Why, I desire as the greatest good, that when my time for active life shall have passed, I may set down at home, enjoying the respect, confidence, goodwill and esteem of all my neighbors, among whom I include, of course, all the people of Seneca county. What a sad thing for me to think of, if I were a Democrat, persisting as you are. I should go into retirement and all the world forsake me, because I have not had wisdom, sagacity and kindness enough of nature, to secure friends who should surround me in old age. (Cheers.) And then to think, once more, of what a fearful thing it is that when you die, to be buried with strangers, and carried to the grave by those you denounced, when alive, as enemies of yourself and your country. But it is perfectly sure that the man who lives henceforth six years a Democrat, and if he lives to old age, will have the shame, in his closing hours, of knowing that the pall-bearers, mourners, priest, and the whole procession, will be Black Republicans! (Prolonged cheers.)

GOV. SEWARD'S SPEECH AT NEW YORK.

DELIVERED NOVEMBER 2, 1860.

Fellow Citizens:—It would surprise, I doubt not, citizens of this metropolis who meet daily on 'Change, and who are found at night in the political and social circles, if I were to claim that I, whose home is in a distant rural district, feel an equal interest and equal pride in the prosperity and greatness of New York. And yet I know not why I should not. The city, and the country around which sustain it, are not separated and isolated from each other, but they are parts of one whole. The town stands, by common consent, for town and country. Certainly, an inhabitant of the suburbs may justly feel that he shares in all the pride and in all the glory of the city, as he certainly is seldom altogether exempt from its misfortunes or disasters. But when a city extends its dimensions so far on all sides as to make the State its suburb, and when, extending still further, it embraces the most remote region of country on the continent as its suburbs, then he who lives outside as well as he who resides within the city gates, feels his heart warmed with the impulses of patriotism, for the town and country become one.

[Here a scene of confusion began, and increased until the entire audience appeared to be in an uproar. Crowds rushed in from the adjoining yard, men rose and stood on the benches, some which broke down, and there was a constant swaying to and fro among those who were standing. At length Superintendent Kennedy came to the front of the platform, and calling in two or three policemen, said there were some men here who wanted to be taken out. The policemen entered the crowd, and several suspicious persons were seen to leave. In the midst of the uproar a voice was heard, saying: "We will hear William H Seward if we stay here till morning." [Cheers.] Partial order having been restored, Superintendent Kennedy said: "I want the first man taken out who proposes cheers in a way to interrupt the speech. (Emphatically) I want him taken out" [Cheers.] Mr. Seward then resumed his speech amid perfect quiet, as follows:]

Fellow-citizens: I have sometimes thought that a man who lives in the country could see about as well what was going on as one who lives in the midst of the excitement of the town or capital—and upon the principle that if you stand a little further back you are apt to see just about as well. [Laughter.] And I certainly have thought so, within a week past, when I have heard or read presses in this metropolis talking of rural districts, of distant counties, and even of states or provinces of New York; and I think so now, when I see presses in New York echoing the sound and alarm of sedition and insurrection, and disunion in distant rural districts, for to me nothing is more plain than that this is a country in which there are no provinces—least of all any provinces which owe allegiance to the city of New York; and, on the other hand, that this is a country in which there are no rural dis-

tricts, near or far, North or South, that can dissolve the bond which binds them to the commercial and social circle of the country. [Applause.]

In the spirit, then, of such a pride in the city in which we stand, as a patriot may feel, I shall hope that I can speak profitably if I treat the political questions of the canvass in their relations to the metropolis of the country. [Applause.] In the beginning of her history, the city of New York was as unconscious of its then future destiny as the country was ignorant itself of this destiny of the city. At the beginning of this century it was a small provincial town; it had just lost the seat of the federal government, and its inland navigation was all included in a sloop navigation from New York bay to the Overslaws, a Albany, together with the navigation of Long Island Sound. Public spirited citizens of New York cast about to see what they could do to continue the prosperity which New York had recently enjoyed in consequence of being the federal capital.

They concluded that it was useless to try to make a commercial city on New York bay, because the commerce of the country was destined to be enjoyed by Boston and Philadelphia, and the wise men of the day, after casting around for all other resources, finally concluded that this island upon which we stand was exactly the best spot in the whole country for the establishment of schools which, by bringing pupils from large portions of the surrounding country, would make a tolerably fair town upon Manhattan island. [Laughter.]

I do not know whether the experiment was attempted, but if it was, I do not doubt that New York was soon distanced in the race of education by Princeton and New Haven. I do not know whether the people of New Jersey and the people of Connecticut had better qualifications for instructing the young; but I must confess, and I speak it, nevertheless, with reverence, that the Scotch, the English, and the Irish schoolmasters and the Dutch which New York city then employed, if they were to be judged from those whom they sent out into the rural districts in my childhood were not altogether the best qualified persons for the task of public education. [Applause, and "three cheers for William H. Seward, the father of free schools."]

Manhattan Island, fellow-citizens, fell by the dispensation of a wise Providence, within the circuit of a great State and a great Nation; and, although that State and that nation thought little and cared less for the city of New York, yet like a great State and a great Nation, they thought chiefly, they thought long, and they cared wisely for their schools. The State owned a broad region, rich in forests, minerals, agricultural and manufacturing resources, lying south of the St Lawrence and west of the falls at Cohoes. Any one could see that a great and flourishing State must arise here, if this great region could be peopled with free men, intelligent men, and if its settlers could be furnished with facilities for access to this, the only seaport in the State. The United States owned a still greater domain, lying just west of the domain of New York, stretching to the Missouri river, and bounded north by the lakes, and south by the River Ohio. Everybody did see that the nation must become a great nation, if they could spread civilization, the civilization of intelligent freemen, over this vast domain, and could connect the seat of that flourishing portion of the country with an adequate support upon the Atlantic coast.

New York city—Manhattan Island, rather—stood just exactly in the bounds to which all the commerce of Western New York, and all the commerce of Western America must converge, if only the right policy was adopted to concentrate that commerce here. To make this great State and this great Nation, it required legislation, not any exercise of power or of force, but only proper and wise legislation to direct and invigorate the existing social forces among us. Therefore nobody, at that day, proposed to conquer any additional territory, or to subjugate foreign nations for the purpose of increasing the greatness of our own. What did it require? You will see in a moment what it required from what was done.

There were in all this State of New York then only 300 000 inhabitants, and of these every seventeenth person was an African slave. There were in the United States only 4 000 000 of people, and of these some half a million were African slaves. Everybody could see that a great State could not be built in New York upon the basis of a white population consisting of only 300 000 souls. Everybody could see that a great nation could not be created in the United States upon a basis of only four millions of souls. And at that time the element of increase, the increasing force was the increase of African negroes instead of white citizens, as well in the State of New York as in the United States. The reason was an obvious one. The African slave trade was in full force, and it was vigorously exercised for the profits of the white man, and much as men denounce the assertion of an irrepressible conflict [great applause] between freedom and slavery in the same community, it was apparent and manifest, then, that that this importation of African negroes, amounting to the exclusion of European freemen, was a bounty, a bonus upon negroes, and there were expensive burthens, costs, and losses upon white men.

I do not know how it is. It is for these philosophers who deny the irrepressible conflict to tell how it was, that, so early as that day, as it has been to this day, wherever a State will admit or import African negroes, voluntary emigrants from Ireland, England, and Germany, will not go. What was to be done to make this great State and this great nation prosperous? It was to diminish the force of the Air can labor—to diminish it and arrest it—and invigorate the force of free emigration. Does anybody doubt that? It required also a system of internal improvements, to be commensurate with the greatness of the regions which were thus to be inhabited; and it required that the free laboring population should be educated and trained, so as to be able to maintain a Republican government. This required the co-operation of the Federal Legislature and of the State Legislature.

The federal legislature addressed themselves to their work in the Congress which preceded the constitution; in the convention which framed a constitution, and in the congress which succeeded the constitution. These three federal legislative authorities settled the whole matter in a manner simple and practical. They did not

extirpate or attempt to extirpate African slavery They did not emancipate or attempt to emancipate the African slaves. They did not even arrest at once the African slave trade. But it did encourage all the Slave States to remove slavery themselves, as soon as they practically could without disturbing the peace and order and interests of society, of which the States were left the sole judges. The next step they took was to prohibit the African slave trade—not immediately, but after the expiration of twenty years and to declare that from and after that time no African slave should ever be introduced into the United States.

They took one step now on the side of free labor—they encouraged free labor by Federal laws, by inviting the emigrant from Europe however poor and penniless; no matter whether he were Catholic, or Protestant, or Jew, or Greek, or Gentile [applause]; no matter whether he was an Englishman, or German, or Pole, or Hungarian, they invited him to come, and inasmuch as all emigration was free, they declared that he might sell the labor which he should perform for years after his arrival to pay the expenses of his transportation to this free land from his native soil. They took one other broad and liberal step, and that was, they declared by laws of naturalization that a freeman emigrating into this country, from whatever land, should, after sufficient probation to establish his character and loyalty, be admitted as a citizen of the Republic, and of every State in it, too, Free State or Slave State, on the same footing with the native born. They took one more step, more effective than all the rest, and that was that they shut up the whole of the unoccupied, unsettled national domain upon which all the future States were to be erected—they shut it up against Slavery and slaves thenceforth and forever. [Applause.]

This is what the Federal legislative authority did—hear, now, what the States did. The prize of commercial greatness and glory was equally sought by all the thirteen States—seven of them seconding the wise, and, I had almost said, and I will say, the pious policy of the Federal Government—abolish Slavery from all their borders—not all at once—not by violence—not by confiscation—but they took such measures in the year 1800, or thereabouts, that twenty-five years afterward—whereas, in the year 1800, every twenty-eighth person was a Slave—in the year 1828, not one Slave was found upon the soil of the State of New York. Six other of the States followed in the same policy, but six more—the more Southern States—declined to pursue that policy, and still determined to compete for the great National commercial prize.

The State of New York had in its early days, enlightened statesmen—men who had not learned the demoralizing doctrine of these times, that virtue and freedom enfeeble a State, and that Slavery is a necessary element of national greatness. Among the great men, and great patriots of that early period, were Christopher Coles, Hamilton, Jay, the Clintons, Tompkins, and, coming later, Rufus King, and not unworthy of the noble association, John W Francis, of the city of New York. [Applause.] The thoughts of these men, then called speculation and imagination, filled the age in which they lived, and they projected and there have since been completed all the great thoroughfares for commerce which were requisite from New York bay to the St Lawrence, and to the lakes, and other States have continued the work until these same channels of intercourse and commerce between the city of New York and other portions of the continent now reach the very borders of our civilization in the West.

One thing more was necessary, and that was education—education for a free people. The foundation of a system of education—equal, fair, just and impartial among all the classes of the citizens—was laid in the State at an early day after much attention, and was finally introduced and established permanently in the City of New York [Applause.] Here, fellow-citizens, I have told you in these few words, the whole foundation of all the prosperity of the State of New York, which now counts a population of four millions, and has a commerce surpassing all the other States; as well as the foundation of the prosperity of the United States, which now, instead of four millions, counts thirty millions, and which have established in the City of New York, as the one port which alone was adequate—a commercial inland, surpassing that of any other capital, and a foreign commerce second only to one in the world. [Applause.

Surely, fellow-citizens, if instead of being now before citizens of this metropolis of this great State and of the United States, I had told this story to a stranger in a foreign land, he would have said, "You have told me of that Atlantis, that happy republic which the ancient philosophers conceived and the ancient poets sung, but which the hard experience of mankind has hitherto proved to be an impossibility and a fabrication." And now, for the future of New York.

I myself, when I was even older than some bearded hearers before me, sought recreation and rest at the city of New York, by hanging around the open tombs in the Potter's field, in what is now Washington Square. And I think a very able and ingenious writer, in a morning newspaper, yesterday called my attention to the fact that he attempted to establish, by a demonstration, that in a period of 150 years the population of the United States would be 300,000,000—that it would surpass the present population of China. I doubt not the figures are accurate. What, then, fifty years hence, for it is to be a gradual progress—what, only a hundred years hence, is to be the magnitude and population of the city of New York? Take into view only two agencies—a combination of the great city of New York and of the United States. In increasing their own greatness—the greatness, glory, and magnificence of New York follow as its necessary and inevitable consequence. The commerce is to be soon, not merely a national commerce, but the commerce of the continent of America. And I need not tell you that the port which enjoys the commerce of the continent of America commands at once the commerce of the globe.

You have now seen what has produced it. What remains, is to consider what is needful to secure this future for the city, as well as for the country, of which you, as well as myself, are necessarily and naturally, and justly so, ambitious. What can it be that is needful to be done, my fellow citizens, but to leave things go on just

exactly as they have gone on hitherto—to leave slavery to be gradually and peacefully circumscribed, and limited hereafter as it has been hitherto—to leave the increase of our own white population, and the increase by foreign immigration, to go on just exactly as they are already going on—to leave the canals and the railroads in full operation as they are—to leave your system of education and toleration to rest upon the basis on which they stand already! (Applause.) There, if you please, is what I understand to be Republicanism. (Loud applause.) I do not know what complexion it wears to your glasses. Men may call it black or green or red, but to me it is pure, simple, unadulterated Republicanism (applause) and Americanism. There is the whole question in this political canvass. If you elect that eminent and able and honest and reliable man, Abraham Lincoln, (loud and prolonged applause) and if, as I am sure you will, during the course of the next four years, constitute the Senate of the United States with a majority like him, (applause) and if, at the present election, you establish the House of Representatives on the same basis, you have then done just exactly this: you have elected men who will leave slavery in the United States just exactly where it is now, (loud applause) and you will have done more than that: you will have left freedom in the United States on every foot and every acre of the public domain, which is the basis of future States, just exactly as it is. (Loud applause.)

There are laws of Congress, there are edicts of presidents and governors, there are judgments, or pretended judgments, (ironical laughter) which have a tendency—if they should stand (renewed laughter) and if they should be continued and renewed by future presidents and future congresses and future judges of the supreme court—to change all these things and to put slavery with the free states again, (voices, "no, no," "never, never,") and to send slavery into and freedom out of the territories of the national domain. [A voice, "It cannot be."] All that we propose to do, all that you will do, and, thank God, all that it is needful to do, is to take care that no more such laws, no more such edicts, no more such judgments, or pretended judgments, are registered. [Applause.] Why, then, since it is so simple, shall you not go on in the same way which was begun by your fathers, and which has been prosecuted so long and with so much success? They tell us that we are to encounter opposition. Why, bless my soul, [laughter] did anybody ever expect to reach fortune, fame or happiness on this earth, or a crown in heaven, without encountering resistance or opposition? What are we made men for but to encounter and overcome opposition arrayed against us in the line of our duty? [Applause.]

But whence comes this opposition, and what is it? I have already alluded to the fact, that fifty years ago, when the seven northern states abolished slavery, the six southern did not see their interest in the same way, and they declined to second or adopt the policy of the day and of the age, but retained slavery. And having retained slavery, the world found out, just about the same time, the usefulness of cotton as a fabric or material for human clothing, and an invention was made by which its manufacture became easy. So the slaveholding states, retaining their slave labor, proceeded to build up a great interest on the growth of cotton; and when they had grown cotton, and made it a great material interest in the country, they then fell down before it and did it homage. I do not say they paid worship to it, but they anointed it king [laughter], and they pronounced allegiance to it a political duty. Did anybody interfere with this homage? Did anybody complain of it? Never. They are at liberty, like ourselves, to raise a commercial, a political, or a social king within the republic. But they set up a throne in *our* midst, and said we, too, must bend and bow before it. And from that requirement we have modestly and firmly—not very firmly, neither, always, [laughter]—but with tolerable persistence, declined.

Now they find that their system does not build up states like New York, but, on the other hand, the six states that pursued their system have remained stationary — or relatively so. The great, the greatest and finest site for commerce on this continent is New Orleans. In early life I made a pilgrimage there to see whether it was not true that that city was to supersede and supplant New York, the capital of my native state, as the city of commerce on this continent. I found that there was ten times the population in New York that there was in New Orleans, and that it was increasing in a ratio of such magnitude that, when New Orleans should have a quarter of a million New York would have a million and a half. I will tell you how I found out this fact. When I went out at night in the city of New York, I saw the cobbler's light twinkling in his window even until the gray of the morning. I saw everything made, as well as sold, everywhere in the city of New York. But when I came to New Orleans, I there found that everything was sold and nothing made. After trying in vain to find an article of human workmanship that was made in the city of New Orleans, I did see a sign opposite the St. Charles hotel with this inscription: "Wagons, carts and wheelbarrows made and sold here." I said: "I have found, then, one thing that is made in New Orleans, to wit: coarse wagons and carts, and rude wheelbarrows." But upon crossing to inspect the matter a little more minutely before entering it in my notes, I found that I had overlooked some words painted in small letters — "at New Haven" [laughter]; so that rightly read, the sign was thus: "Wagons, carts, and wheelbarrows; made at New Haven, sold here." [Renewed laughter.]

Fellow-citizens, this is not a reproach; it it not spoken reproachfully of New Orleans. It would not become me to do so. But it is their system. They employ slaves; and in New York, I was going to say, we employ freemen, but I think I will reverse it, and say that freemen employ their masters. [Laughter and applause.] This is but an illustration. The principle is the same in every department of industry, every department of manufacture. Now the slave states not only build no great cities, but they build no great states compared with these free states. There is one great distinction, and that is, the free states multiply and replenish the continent with free states. But the slave states fail to multiply and replenish the continent with slave states; and they say that the reason is not in the nature of slavery and freedom relatively, but in the injustice of not allowing them first to establish slave territory; and they are coming to say next, as they logically must, that we must

re-open the African slave trade, and so to furnish a supply for slave states. The opposition is founded upon this state of facts. Is it reasonable to concede to it? We cannot do so unless we are willing to arrest the prosperity, the growth, and the greatness of our city, of our state, and of our country. And that would seem to end the argument.

But they then resort to terror and menace. They tell us that they will withdraw their trade from the city of New York, unless her citizens will vote as they require them to vote—for their supposed interest. Is it best to yield to that? Why, fellow citizens, New York is not a province of Virginia or of Carolina, any more than they are provinces of New York or of Connecticut. New York is the Metropolis of the country; New York must be the Metropolis of the continent. Her commerce, like her principles, must be elevated, equal, just, impartial toward every state; toward freedom, at least, if they must be tolerant of slavery. But they proceed to tell us that, if we do not accede to their demands, they will secede and dissolve the Union. Shall we then surrender? That involves the question whether they will secede and dissolve the Union if we do not. What then is it that we purpose to do, which they require us not to do? Why, it is simply to vote for the man that we prefer over the three men, or the no man that they prefer. [Great laughter.] Is there any offense in that? Why, that is just what the Constitution says we may do. And, insomuch as there must necessarily be a difference of opinion amongst us, the Constitution requires every man, not to vote for the man that somebody else wants elected, but for the man he himself prefers over everybody else. [Applause.]

Well, they say, nevertheless, they must take offense. We ask, is not this right? Why, yes, so far you are all right. Why, then, will you dissolve? They reply, "we will dissolve because that Mr. Lincoln, and a whig Congress, will commit aggressions upon us after they are elected." Very well, we say; but is it not prudent, is it not reasonable, to wait for them to be elected first and commit the aggressions [laughter and applause], or attempt it, at least? They answer, "no, we cannot afford to wait for the overt act, because the overt act may never be committed [great laughter and applause], or if it shall be committed, we shall be so much demoralized that we cannot resist and vindicate our rights." Well, I will not argue the latter point. But I do believe better of them than they proclaim of themselves. I know their manhood, their spirit, their courage, and their chivalry, and I know enough of human nature to know also that he that waits until the overt act is committed before he strikes back, will be able to recover his rights a thousand times sooner than he who strikes before any overt act is committed. [Applause.]

But why shall we expect that the President Lincoln, and his cabinet, and the Congress, will commit aggressions against the slave states. They cannot do it constitutionally; and what they cannot constitutionally do cannot be done in this country. [Applause.] Besides, who are these men who are to commit these unconstitutional aggressions? They are citizens of the United States, chosen by their fellow-citizens, if not altogether the best, yet from the best of any part of the free states. Are they less likely to be honest, and just, and wise, and prudent statesmen than the men selected from the same constituencies who have heretofore filled the seats in Congress? Aye; but they tell us that this Republican party is driven on by enthusiasts, and madmen, and fanatics, and that they will control, instead of being restrained by, their statesmen. This Republican party, that next Tuesday is to elect Abraham Lincoln President of these United States [great applause], what will it be but a majority of the American people? [Applause.]

If it is less than that, it cannot elect anybody. [Laughter and applause.] If it elects anybody, it will be precisely the same American people that has tolerated the government in the abuse of constitutional powers, out of tenderness to the South, and to all the slave states, for the period of fifty years. [Applause.] It will be as forbearing still as it can be and maintain the principles of freedom; and to maintain those principles, as I have already shown you, involves no action of the government in any unconstitutional direction whatever. But they tell us that we argue only upon reason. But what we fear is, that the South, the slave states, will not listen to reason. They are excited; they are disturbed; they are passionate; and they will go out of the Union, reason or no reason, right or wrong.

Well, fellow citizens, I think very different of the South, as I do of the North. The elevation of a chief magistrate of a great republic of thirty millions of people, brings every party and every interest to use the best arguments to sustain its cause that it has. We give them the arguments that some have submitted to you so often here, and which I attempted to renew to night. They give us in return—what? Denunciation and threats. Well, they are not a very logical form of argument; but they are not to be blamed who use them, for they are all the argument they have. [Laughter and applause.] But what is it our duty to do? To threaten back again? to fulminate menace for menace, and denunciation for denunciation? No; but to listen and hear with patience, with kindness, with fraternal feeling and sympathy. [Applause] For we do expect them to hear our arguments, and our arguments are much harder to hear than theirs are. [Applause and Laughter.]

I do not think these threats before election evidences of revolution and disunion after the election, for the simple reason that I have always found that a man who does intend to strike a fatal blow, does not give notice so long beforehand. [Applause.] And for ten, nay, twenty years, these threats have been renewed, in the same language and in the same form, about the first day of November, every four years, when it happened to be just before the presidential election. A man intoxicated may threaten; but he never knows what he will do when he becomes sober, [laughter and applause], as all the world knows that no sober man can tell what he may do if he should suffer himself to be overtaken by intoxication. A man in a passion can never tell what he will do when he is cool; as everybody knows from his own experience that he very often does when he is cool much wiser things than those he meditates doing when he is hot. [Applause.]

These menaces are made by politicians in

the name of the people of the slave states. As I have said, what else can you expect them to do? Why, it was but the other day in the State of Michigan, a citizen asked me what I thought of the state of New York. I said I thought it sure for Lincoln, and he told me that Mr. Douglas had just come from the State of New York and they had told him that he claimed that he was going to carry the State of New York himself. [Great laughter.] Well, said I, my good friend, how can I help it if Mr. Douglas does say so? Well, said he, I want to know whether you think that he thinks so. [Great laughter.] Said I, I certainly cannot answer for what Mr. Douglas thinks; but now, my dear, good sir, will you allow me to ask you one question? If Mr. Douglas is running as a candidate for the Presidency, and if he is canvassing for himself, and if you ask him whether he thinks he is going to carry the state of New York, which is necessary to his success, what else can he tell you except that he thinks he will? [Renewed laughter.] So I do not doubt that these Southern statesmen or politicians think that they are going to dissolve the Union. But I think they are going to do no such thing. And I will tell you in a very few words why I think so.

He who, in this country, thinks that this government, this Constitution, can be thrown down, and that this union of states can be dissolved, has first no faith in the Constitution; he has no faith in the Union; no faith in the people of the states; no faith in the people of the United States; no faith in loyalty; no faith in freedom; no faith in reason; no faith in justice; no faith in prudence; no faith in virtue. I am not unwilling to see the number of that class of the American people brought out, so that we may see them altogether.

For my part, I, on the contrary, have faith in the Constitution; faith in the Union; faith in the people of the states and of the nation; faith in freedom; faith in justice; faith in virtue, and faith in humanity. The Constitution and the Union have stood eighty years, only upon the foundation of such a faith existing among the American people. It will stand and survive this presidential election, and forty presidential elections afterward. Yes, I trust they will stand a hundred and a thousand, because the people, since this government was established, have grown wiser, more just, more humane, and more virtuous than they were when it was first established. [Great applause.]

GOV. SEWARD'S SPEECH AT AUBURN

THE NIGHT BEFORE THE BATTLE.

Citizens with faces, whether young or old, yet still familiar faces: I have been a wanderer of late. From our own laughing home here on the banks of the Owasco, to where the Green Mountains cast their lengthened shadows over the Connecticut at Windsor. After a stay there too short for rest, but not for happiness, to the springs of the Penobscot From the Penobscot escaping or breaking through nets set for me by not unfriendly hands, to renew my oath of fealty at the tombs of the elder and the younger Adams at Quincy. From Massachusetts Bay across green hills and greener valleys, over the Hudson, across the Seneca, up and down the Genesee, and coasting the Lakes of Ontario, Erie, Huron, and Michigan, down the Illinois to its confluence with the Mississippi, up the shrivelled river to where it breaks into rapids; and above them where the fountains which supply equally the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi, gush from the earth. Across Minnesota and Iowa, down to Nebraska and Kansas, where American civilization, on its verge, is scaling the Rocky Mountains, and bringing forth their precious treasure of silver and gold; and thence back again with an eager returning spirit to the Metropolis where sits the soul that sends forth all the mighty energy of that civilization; and then by a hurried flight back again in the night to find my home leafless under the winds of autumn, but already gathering force to put forth a greener and broader foliage in the coming year.

These are my travels. You will ask me "what have you seen; what have you learned?" Rather, my friends, ask me what I have not seen, and what unknown, or but imperfectly understood before, I have not learned now and fully understand. I have seen a great nation—a greater nation than I saw last year, although then I traveled the Old World from the Dead Sea to the pillars of Hercules; a greater nation than has existed in ancient or in modern times I saw not only the country, its forests, its mountains, its rivers, its lakes, and its prairies, but I saw its people, men, women and children, many, many millions of every nation and of every derivation. You will ask me "did you find this people prosperous and happy?" Ask yourselves, for you are of them; you are free; you are industrious,

you are intelligent; and therefore you are prosperous and happy, and so are they. It would consume twenty-four hours to tell you in detail what I have seen, and we have not twenty-four hours. There is work to be done before the evening star shall rise to-morrow and you and I must have a hand in it, as I am sure we have hearts in it—have we not? [Cries of "yes, yes," and applause.] I saw this country and this people in their best days, not feeble, sickly, scrawny, but a nation in the full maturity of youthful vigor. I saw this people engaged in a great achievement peculiar to themselves—one perfectly successful by no other nation on earth, and one almost unattempted by any nation of ancient or modern times. They were engaged in choosing magistrates and legislators who should make and execute their laws, and strangest of all, a chief magistrate to preside over them. Such as in other climes men call "Cæsar," "Emperor," and "King," and come to think "Divine." I met among them them the heir apparent of a monarch upon whose realms the sun never sets, inspecting the curious workings of this strange achievement. I do not know what he thought, but I tell you what I thought as I saw him looking on. I said to myself "if this system should continue and work well for a few brief years more it will work the downfall and extinguishment of your dynasty, and not only of your dynasty, but of all the dynasties of all the monarchies and all the aristocracies on the face of the habitable globe, then, thenceforth and forever. [Applause.

Oh, fellow-citizens, how important to the interests of the human race is it that this experiment shall continue to work well.

But you will say, "tell us of this election; how will it result; will the Republican party and the cause of Freedom prevail to-morrow?" Again I say, ask yourselves. The sentiment of Freedom, the emotions of virtue, are vigorous and active, and hope is buoyant over the face of all the Free States. All of them have practically spoken already, and spoken for Lincoln and Freedom. [Great applause.] But enough have not yet spoken to decide the contest. It is for you, for the people of New York, to decide it. If it be lost, the responsibility, sad and sorrowful as it would be, would fall upon us. If it is won, it is the crown, not of one campaign, but the crown of a struggle in which you and I have been engaged in darker days, and under more unpropitious auspices, for a period of thirty years.

But, fellow citizens, this hour of conversation between you and myself, neighbors as we are, is too short, and comes too seldom to be occupied with the details, however exciting, of the popular election which is to be closed to-morrow. You have been accustomed heretofore to indulge me with broader, higher thoughts, and nobler speculations. The question, looking through this election to-morrow, and forward through many elections presses home upon us,—whatever may be the result, auspicious as I am almost sure it will be,—shall freedom, justice and humanity ultimately and in the end prevail; are these Republican institutions of ours safe and permanent? I have sought and entered the Hall of Prophecy. I may not tell you just where it stands, but this much I can say that its entrance is through native forest shades, from the waters edge of a deep and flowing river. I entered it, not irreverently, not unconscious of the presumption of attempting to explore the will of the God, whose rule, however men may deny or profess, is higher law. [Applause.] The two gigantic figures, Time and Destiny, which guarded the approach to the altar seemed to relax their grim features as I passed, and the one dropped his scythe, and the other balanced for a moment the hour glass, which he held in his hand. I learned from the oracle that the powers above favor the perpetuation of these institutions, and that they are never to fall by the hand of any foreign enemy; that they are to be saved or to be lost by the action of the American people; that a great danger, a danger that has been long gathering is at this very moment being passed, and that this danger once passed, there is assurance of long life, aye, of immortality to the institutions of American freedom. [Great applause.] I asked for a sign, but the oracle replied to me, "why do this generation look for a sign? I say unto you that no sign shall be given to this generation, but a rule shall be given to them adequate to every emergency, and that rule is *let the American people rule their own spirit*" [Applause.]

This people are human, and because they are human, they have accidental and temporary interests and passions and prejudices to mislead them; but also, because they are human, they have reason to conduct them through all temptations and all perils, in the way of wisdom. A mysterious Providence has permitted, does always permit, error to exist everywhere, contemporaneously with truth, wrong with right, freedom with Slavery; and between these different powers there is always an irrepressible conflict. [Applause.] That conflict is the trial of human virtue; a triumph of the good over the bad constitutes the perfection of human nature. Slavery was probably essential to the success of the institutions of Republicanism. That continually provoking conflict, as continually stimulated virtue, and the love of freedom. The fathers, rejecting the sinister counsels of interest and suppressing passions and prejudice, surveyed the continent when they established our government, and they adopted the policy which alone was possible.

They could not extirpate slavery at a blow. Probably it had been unwise if they had attempted it; but they had adopted a policy marked equally by sagacity, and by benevolence which is told in a very few words. Its effect was to be the abridgement of the power, and duration of Slavery by practicable, peaceful means, and the invigoration and ultimate establishment of universal freedom. [Great applause.] How this was to be done, requires as few words to tell. The African slave trade, which was then exercised in bringing slaves to do the cultivation of the whole continent—and if it had continued, would have covered the land with savage Africans, stolen from their native land—was to be abolished after twenty years, during which time the American people might, as they could, procure supplies of free labor from oppressed and groaning Europe, to supply its place. The States were encouraged and stimulated to provide, by acts of gradual emancipation, for the removal of slavery altogether. The whole of the public domain, then unoccupied, lying north-

west of the Ohio river, was set apart exclusively for freedom, and for the erection of new and future free States. Free emigration from all the nations of Europe, of whatever faith or language, was invited by the permission given to the emigrant to pledge his labor for a term of years, so that he might pay the cost of his passage. And to all these was added that boon of boons, that offer, the richest that any nation ever had to give,—an equal citizenship by naturalization to the immigrant of whatever race or name, or lineage, with the native born.

You see how simple this system was. Mark, now, while I tell you in a few words how effective it was. Within twenty years the African slave trade ceased, and never until one year ago did the soil of America again bear the tread of a native African bondman. Seven of the States rapidly removed slavery by prospective laws, which, while they deprived no man of what he called his property, but left his slave to be his slave for life, still in a period of twenty-five years there remained on the soil of those States not one native born or imported African slave. And whereas, in this State of New York of ours, on the day when it became independent, every seventeenth inhabitant was a slave. In the year 1825, no one slave was found upon its soil. [Applause.] And the redemption came under the invitation of that liberal law, from Germany, France, Holland, England, Scotland and Ireland, and they became naturalized without question as to their former allegiance, or their religious faith, and they are now our brethren, and by ties of kindred are mixed and mingled with the American people. There is scarcely one man or woman who can trace to a parentage of one nation of Europe an undivided lineage. The blood of the Dane and Hungarian—the Irishman and the German—the Frenchman and Englishman—are intermingled until we have become the descendants and representatives of enlightened christian nations throughout the whole continent of Europe.

And then five new States rose upon that public domain, and all of them Free States; and this process still being continued that five, added to the other seven which had emancipated, making twelve, has already been increased, until whereas twelve of the original thirteen States were Slave States, now eighteen of the States are Free States, and only fifteen are Slave States. As it has been ordered wisely, so all was going on prosperously and at the expiration of the present century, Slavery would either have ceased to exist, or have been languishing or dying in the midst of what would have been practically universal liberty, but for one of those singular accidents, one of those strange events which, occurring in the course of human affairs, produces a reaction, and for a time the cause which was suppressed, goes forward, and the cause which was expected to triumph, recedes. That accident was nothing more than that an ingenious countryman of ours, and a lover of Freedom as much as you or I, invented a machine by which he could, with greater ease, extract the seeds from the fibers in cotton balls, and thus, giving a cheaper value to cotton, and increasing the demand for it, for fabrics of human wear, cotton became the production of slave labor in six Slave States, or in a portion of them, and became King in those States, commanded emancipation to cease, shut foreigners out from their ports, demanded a rescinding of all the laws which forbid Slavery to spread over the American soil, demanded room for new Slave Territories and new Slave States, and began the dreadful work of preparation for the restoration of the African Slave Trade.

You know too well to need that I should repeat it, the rapidity and violence of that reaction. You know how it bought up parties, and statesmen and capitalists through all of the free States, and moulded them as the image-maker moulds the moistened plaster, to its demands. You know how that under the very first earnest, vehement, violent demand of Slavery, Missouri and Arkansas were admitted into the Union, Slave States, by a people under the influence of terror, who had, only twenty years before, abolished the African Slave Trade, and denied Slavery another acre of American soil. You know how Texas, a free country in Mexico, was overrun, first by slaveholders with slaves, and then brought into the American Union, with the consent of yourselves, that five Slave States might be made out of its soil. You know how California and Mexico and Utah, free lands, free soil, inhabited by men of free speech and free thought, were conquered and brought into the Union with the expectation—only baffled by the perseverance of a few men in despair, of whom I was one—of establishing Slavery upon the Pacific coast. [Applause.] And you know, finally, how Presidents and Cabinets, Ministers and Foreign Ministers, and at last the Judges, came to confess a faith, alien from the Constitution, and alien from the spirit of all our institutions, that the normal condition of every Territory under the flag of the United States is not Freedom but Slavery, and that no power existing on the soil, no power existing in other States, no power existing in the Congress of the United States, or in any department of the Federal Government, can challenge it, and say, "How came you, or what do you here?"

This was the reaction, and it culminated only six years ago. Never, never was a nation more thoroughly demoralised. The Whig party, that had affected sympathy for Freedom, faltered and failed in the hour of trial, and went down. The Democratic party, bolder than ever, became the unblushing advocate of Slavery, ceased to be longer, or to pretend to be, a party of human freedom, but became a party of human bonds. There was no party for Freedom. Jealousies were engendered between American free-born freemen, and the voluntary citizens, and at the time when both should have been engaged in rescuing the Constitution, which secured the soil for them and their children, and their children's children, as a patrimony for Freedom, they were engaged in internecine hostilities, the only effect of which could be to let Slavery go roaming over the whole territories. [Applause.]

Such, my friends, was the real condition of things when I addressed you in the Park on South street, only four years ago. You were a thoughtless, an excited, a bewildered people. I saw a party forming for Freedom, but it was unorganised and discordant, and filled with mutual jealousies. It was the only hope for Freedom, but it failed, and it seemed as if it must fail though it "charmed never so wisely," to win the American people. It seemed to me

then that I saw the good angel of my country rising up and bidding her a last farewell.

But now all is changed. The elements of freedom which that Republican party took in at that day are so invigorating, so renewing that they have within four years made it a mighty, yes, an unconquerable host. [Great applause.] They have taken the reins of the State government in most every one of the Free States, and they lay close siege to what are left in the hands of slavery. They appear strong and vigorous, and have already achieved free speech, free thought and free debate in three Slave States, Delaware, Maryland and Missouri [prolonged cheers], and the battle recedes immediately after this contest, from the Free States into the Slave States, and the slaveholders instead of boasting that they are national, and we, Republicans, are sectional, are already beginning to feel what it is to be attempting to extend and fortify an institution which is purely sectional, into Territories that belong to the nation, against the will of the nation. [Applause.]

It has been long that this reaction has been working and its history will bring out into a new light controversies that, to all around us seemed to be already buried in the past. You, laboring men, and especially you of foreign birth, naturalized citizens, can you tell me why it is that you are here among these men in this community, and in the employment of men whom you accuse so often with sympathy with the negro to your prejudice? Why is it that you are here in a land that you call a land of abolitionists? Why are you not in Virginia and in North Carolina and in South Carolina and in Louisiana, among the slave drivers whom you applaud and approve for their inhumanity to the negro? It is because Slavery will not tolerate one of you upon its soil. [Applause.] You manufacturers, whose mills have been put up, whose wheels have been so often put in motion only to encounter hostile legislation in Congress under the influence of the Slave power of the Slave States, will you tell me why it is that the government of the United States maintains, as its true and settled policy that an American citizen must carry all his materials to the manufacturers and workshops of England to be wrought up into fabrics by the mechanics, artisans and manufacturers of England, and must send his wheat, his corn, his beef and his pork to support those manufacturers in England, instead of bringing the educated and trained artists and machinists of England here to set up his mills, to put his wheels in motion upon the banks of the Mohawk, the Owasco, the Seneca and the Niagara rivers?

The explanation is a simple one; slavery wants as little of the industry of the white man in the nation as possible. [Cheers.] Can you tell me why it is that the expenses of the government, which have risen in the period of 32 years from ten millions of dollars, to eighty, ninety and a hundred millions of dollars annually, must be levied in such a way as to discourage American manufacturers, and that the deficiency, if there be any, of revenue, must be paid out of the sales of the public lands of the United States, at a dollar and a quarter per acre, when there are in every city, in every town, in every village, and in every hamlet of the land, poor, unfortunate white men, with their families, seeking and asking for a living upon this public domain,—and willing to convert it into farms, yielding and paying revenue to the United States? It is simply because slavery is unwilling that the free white man should go there. [Applause.]

Can you account for the obstinate resistance to the enlargement of the Erie canal, continued so long, on any other ground?

Can you tell me why it was that twenty years ago, this whole State was filled with alarm because equal and free education was being extended to the children of the Catholic and the foreigner, upon the ground that, as the children of the foreigner were to be future members of the State, it was important, not more to them than to the State itself, that they should be prepared for citizenship? Oh! then the Bible was in danger. Oh! then the Protestant church was to go down. All this hostility to Education was the suggestion of slavery in order that free white men might not come to swell the population of the free States, and swarm into the new States beyond the Alleghany Mountains. [Applause.]

But all this is ended. The agents, and the parties who were deceived, misled and perverted, who opposed the interests of freedom, have all within six years fallen and disappeared. The Whig party once cherished by so many of us, and relied upon with faith and hope against evidence, proved unfaithful at last and perished, and I know not one sound thinking man, however, much as he was attached to it, that laments its loss. The American party that sought to deceive itself with the idea that it could secure forbearance for freedom in the new alliance formed with slaveholders in the south, suddenly, even more suddenly disappeared, and there is not one man living to vindicate its memory. And so the Democratic party had a form and existence a year ago. Where is it now. It has changed its form as often as a guilty dream. It was single, united, unterrified and violent a year ago. Six months passed and it wore two forms in hostile attitude against each other. Six months later the two have disappeared, and now it is nowhere. [Laughter and cheers.] An opposition is organized but it is an organization, not of the Democratic party, but of three parties. It presents not one candidate, but three candidates for President. [Laughter.] It comes up to fight its first, last and desperate battle with the Republican party which is engaged in the effort and determination to elect a President by a majority of votes; and this hybrid party comes up and puts into the hands of the electors, ballots for scattering the votes, not concentrating them; to defeat the election of a President of the United States because you cannot agree whom you will elect. Strange confusion of the times, this! Have you ever studied the present creed of the opposition? I will endeavor to recite it for you:—

"I believe in intervening in the Territories of the U. S. for slavery; I also fully believe in non-intervening in the Territories of the U. S. for slavery, [laughter,] and I further believe that it is not right either to intervene or to not intervene. [renewed laughter.] Each of these three articles of faith is essential and of saving health to the nation. He that is faithful must believe them all, and he that is faithful must believe one and reject the other two, [roars of laughter.] I believe in Stephen A. Douglas as a candidate for the Presidency of the U. S., and I pledge myself

to vote for him to the exclusion of everybody else. I also believe in John C Breckenridge, and I pledge myself to vote for him to the exclusion of Stephen A. Douglas and of everybody else; and I also equally and implicitly believe in John Bell as a candidate for President of the U. S., and I pledge myself to vote for him to the exclusion of Douglas and Breckenridge. I promise faithfully to vote for them all, and to vote, at the same time, against either one, except the one not designated as my choice." [Laughter and great applause.]

Now here is the trinity in unity and unity in trinity, of the political church, just now came to us by the light of a new revelation, and christened "Fusion." [Laughter and cheers.] And this "Fusion" party, what is the motive to which it appeals? You may go with me into the streets to night and follow the Little Giants, who go with their torch lights and their flaunting banners of "Popular Sovereignty;" or you may go with the smaller and more select and modest band who go for Breckenridge and slavery; or you may follow the music of the clanging bells, [laughter] and, strange to say, they will all bring you into one common chamber. [Laughter.] When you get there you will hear only this emotion of the human heart appealed to, fear,—fear that if you elect a President of the United States according to the constitution and the laws to-morrow, you will wake up the next day and find that you have no country for him to preside over. [Laughter.] Is that not a strange motive for an American patriot to appeal to? And in that same hall, amid the jargon of three discordant members of the Fusion party, you will hear one argument, and that argument is, that so sure as you are so perverse as to cast your vote singly, lawfully, honestly, as you ought to do, for one candidate for the Presidency, instead of scattering it among three candidates, so that no President may be elected, this Union shall come down over your heads, involving you and us in a common ruin.

Fellow citizens, it is time, high time, that we know whether this is a constitutional government under which we live. It is high time that we know, since the Union is threatened, who are its friends and who are its enemies. The Republican party who propose in the old appointed constitutional way to choose a President, are every man of them loyal to the Union. The disloyalists, wherever they may be, are those who are opposed to the Republican party and attempt to prevent the election of a President. I know that our good and esteemed neighbors—Heaven knows I have cause to respect and esteem and honor and love them as I do, for such neighbors as even my Democratic neighbors, no other man ever had—I know that they do not avow, nor do they mean to support, or think they are supporting disunionists. But I tell them that he who proposes to lay hold of the pillars of the Union and bring it down into ruin, is a disunionist; that every man who quotes him, and uses his threats and his menaces as an argument against our exercise of our duty, is an abettor, unconscious though he may be, of disunion; and that when to morrow's sun shall have set and the next morning's sun shall have risen upon the American people, rejoicing in the election of Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency, [prolonged cheers] those men who to day sympathize with, uphold, support and excuse the disunionists, will have to make a sudden choice and choose whether, in the language of the Senator from Georgia, they will go for treason and so make it respectable, or whether they will go with us for Freedom, for the Constitution, and for Eternal Union.

AMERICANS REPUDIATE FUSION!

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES O. PUTNAM,

AGAINST THE

SALE OF THE AMERICAN PARTY TO THE DOUGLAS DEMOCRACY.

Delivered in Rochester, August 8, at a Meeting called by over Four Hundred Americans.

The following resolutions were presented by ROSWELL HART, Esq., and adopted with immense applause:

Resolved. That as Americans we supported Mr. Fillmore in 1856, because of his fidelity, when at the head of the Government, to the great measures of peace which, under the auspices of Mr. Clay, were pronounced a "final settlement" of the slavery question; because of his manly opposition to the repeal of the Sacred Compact of 1820, which secured the territory north of 36 degrees and 30 minutes, to freedom; because we believed that if elected, he would bring the whole power of his administration to secure justice to every section, and interest of the country. And we here tender him our thanks for so justly laying the responsibility of all the evils which have afflicted the country for the last six years, in connection with the Slavery question to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. His letter to the Union meeting in New York, in February last, justifies all we have ever claimed for his justice and magnanimity.

Resolved, That, holding Stephen A. Douglas directly responsible for the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise and for the inauguration of the Revolutionary policy which has thrown down so many of the safeguards of the Constitution, converting it from an instrument of justice between the different sections of the country into an instrument of slave propagandism, at the expense of the equality of the States, and the rights of free men and free labor, we will never yield him, directly or indirectly, our support; we will never be the dupes of a bargain which promises ten votes to a man we respect and honor, while it creates twenty-five men of equal power pledged to the fortunes of Mr. Douglas.

Resolved, That in the Chicago Platform on the subject of Slavery, we find principles for which, as Americans, we have always contended, and we accept it as a sound basis of political faith—faithful to the Constitution and the whole country.

Resolved, That we support Abraham Lincoln because we see in his whole political life a sound, comprehensive Statesmanship, a national heart that embraces in his affections his whole country, and an eminent sense of public justice. We find him firmly committed to the great principles of preserving freedom to territory now free, and of resistance to the revolutionary doctrines of the Democratic party, we find him as firmly maintaining all the balances and compromises of the Constitution made by our fathers, whose maintenance alone can preserve in its integrity this glorious Republic.

Hon. JAMES O. PUTNAM, of Chautauqua, was then introduced by the President, and received round after round of applause. He spoke as follows:

GENTLEMEN, your call is in these words:

"Of those who have been hitherto identified with the American party, but who, since the recent attempt to merge that organization into the Democratic party, and seeing no practical way in which they can aid in the election of Bell and Everett, have determined to support Lincoln and Hamlin for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States, as the best and only alternative left for their political action."

I am happy to meet you on this occasion. I know the ground on which I tread; I know the men at whose summons I have appeared here; men who formed a part of that body of one hundred and twenty-five thousand of the citizens of New York who in 1856 sought to restore peace to the country and justice to its Administration, by the election of Millard Fillmore. Men who recognize in no man living an infallible teacher; on whose necks is found no collar inscribed "Born thrall of Cedric." Men of independent thought, who spurn alike the thraldom of religious hierarchies and of political juntas. Men trained for the most part in the school of Henry Clay, who learned from his lips those sentiments of national justice and national brotherhood, which have inspired, and ever will inspire, their political action. Men, I will add, who bring to the Republican altar no apologies for their political past, and no hostages but their own true hearts for their political future. You say in your call that it is your purpose in the campaign of 1860, to vote for Abraham Lincoln. Your organization to which you adhered as I adhered so long as it had a single flag waving, as an independent power, has gone down under the flood of current events.

There is no American party, it has no candidate for the Presidency, and all its members

---

☞FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF THE ALBANY EVENING JOURNAL. PRICE, PER SINGLE COPY, 2c.; PER DOZEN COPIES, 20c.; PER HUNDRED, $1· PER THOUSAND, $8.

have melted or will melt away into one of the two great parties which are contesting for New York. For, gentlemen, there are but two parties in this state. Virtually there are but two candidates—Lincoln and Douglas. With all the respect I entertain for Mr. Bell, I say he has no party in New York. He has the shadow of one, it is but a shadow, its *substance* is Douglas. He has some friends who say they have secured ten electoral votes to aid in his election, but with the same breath, they confess that they create twenty-five men to strike him down in the Electoral College. It may seem a serious and manly game to those who play it, but to us who refuse to unite in thus garlanding our ancient friend for the altar of his enemies, it seems the broadest farce ever enacted before high Heaven. Gentlemen, I too, shall vote for Abraham Lincoln; not because I indorse everything that every Republican orator has uttered on the stump or elsewhere; not because I approve of every measure which some members of the party have sought to engraft on State Legislation; not because I have changed my own views upon the questions which arose in 1850 to divide the Whig party, and which entered more or less into the discussions of the canvass of 1856; not because I have grown less national in my political sympathies or sentiments; not because I think "the universal negro" is my social equal, or in any State where the Anglo Saxon race is the dominant one, he should be made in all respects their political equal. Others may vote for him, for any or all of these reasons, but as for me and my house, I sustain him because I believe him to be a just and adequate man; because on the question of the day the Republican party at the Chicago convention planted itself on ground which I believe to be just and national, and because I believe the country needs repose on the subject of slavery, in its legislative halls, and that this endless agitation of the slavery question can never be suppressed until we overthrow the arch agitators, the chief thunderers on this Negro Olympus—the leaders of the Democratic party.

Gentlemen, I do not come here to disguise any fact or any sentiment, but to present my views of the questions of the day as frankly as my nature is capable of presenting them. I start then with this proposition: My support of Lincoln, in view of the principles involved in the contest, is to me, a New York American, the natural, the logical sequence of my support of Mr. Fillmore in 1856. The corollary of the proposition is this: To vote for twenty-five electors pledged to Mr. Douglas, thus giving him about one-sixth of all necessary to secure his election, however the dose may be sweetened to prevent nausea, would be to belie my whole life, and sacrifice every principle for which, as an American, I contended.

First, I ask you, what class of men north and south did Mr. Fillmore represent? The old Whig or Clay party south who had no sympathies with the slave propagandising element of the Democratic party, or with the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, but having an earnest purpose to rebuke that stupendous wrong by the elevation of a man known to be hostile to it. Men whose fortunes were bound up with the South, but still of just and moderate views of the Henry Clay type on the whole group of the slavery questions. Men who stood, as they now stand, ready to put down disunion wherever and whenever it shows its hydra head, and who then felt as we felt, that the only way to restore peace to the country, was to overthrow the Democratic party, whose whole life and breath is agitation.

The American party at the North, and especially in New York, were men, the great body of whom, in relation to the revolution inaugurated in 1854, and in relation to the outrages of border ruffianism in Kansas, and in relation to the great doctrines of the Fathers, that Freedom is the creature of divine law, the normal condition of every inch of territory, and slavery the creature of local law, sympathised with the Republicans. Those were living issues, and upon them they cordially agreed. There were dead questions, not issues, growing out of the Compromise of 1850, which were galvanized into spasmodic action in that campaign, about which they differed with the Republicans. But they had no practical bearings, and were only of service to intensify and embitter the canvass.

Every act of the Democratic party and of its leaders, from 1854 down through the canvass of 1856, was calculated to inflame to madness the northern mind. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise promising peace, and giving us civil war, making the territory of Kansas the theatre of unparalleled outrages and wrongs, for a time jostled the most conservative men from their calm anchorage, while they kindled into devouring flame the great mass of the opposition. Then succeeded the attack of Brooks on Sumner, in the Senate, the most dastardly and base act of cowardice that ever degraded a legislative hall, an act sanctioned, honored and rewarded by the Democratic South. Then it was that a storm of indignation arose at the North, which when at its height would have swept before it the pillars of the government, had they stood in its way. The Presidential campaign came on the heel of all these events, and it took a man storm proof to resist the current that swept devouringly by him. But the great mass of New York Americans remembered that in the slave States were the old friends of the Union and the Constitution, their brother Girondists, who were willing to try with them to find a deliverance by the middle path of conservative action. They hoped to do so by the election of Millard Fillmore. And here let me for the truth of history say, that the great body of New York Americans sustained Mr. Fillmore to elect him. If any man in the American party employed it to draw off forces from the support of Fremont to enure to the benefit of Buchanan, he was a betrayer of a noble trust for the most unworthy purposes. I thought, you thought, we could overthrow the Democratic party, and rebuke Pierce and Douglas and all other plotters against their country's peace, by preserving our relations with our Southern allies. We tried it faithfully, we failed signally, and under circumstances much more favorable for an election of a middle ground man by a middle ground party than the present. And if there be a single Republican within the sound of my voice, who still doubts the soundness of Mr. Fillmore on the question of the Repeal and its outgrowths, let me tell him that had we succeeded, and not failed with our candidate as you failed with yours, border ruffianism, and ballot box stuffing, would never have been heard of in Kansas, but the whole power of the government would have been brought to give security and peace to the settlers, and Kansas, long ere

this, would have taken her place as a free State in the glorious sisterhood of the Republic. But we failed, and you failed, and between our divided forces the Democratic party entered upon new successes to the perpetration of new outrages, and of bolder attacks upon the Federal Constitution. It has taken long strides toward the complete revolution of the government on the slavery question, it needs but the success of the author of all our present evils to consummate their purpose.

We sustained Mr. Fillmore to rebuke and suppress the agitation, by the Democratic party, of slavery in Congress. Its agitation by discussion among the people upon ethical or economic principles, if it must pass by that name, can never, ought never to be suppressed. You must crush out all thought, all sensibility, all human feeling, before civilized men will cease to discuss all the relations which labor bears to capital in any quarter of the globe. So long as man is interested in his fellow-man, so long he will feel and write, and talk upon a question so close to the heart of humanity. But when it comes to acts of aggressive legislation, when the public peace is disturbed by revolutionary doctrines, engrafted upon the compact of the Fathers, or by revolutionary overthrow of subsequent compacts of equal moral force and obligation; when the stronger in political power thus seek to defraud the weaker; whether the aggression come from North or from the South, from slave propagandists, or abolition propagandists, then is the time for conservative men to take the field, and to resist the innovation. You and I recognize all the constitutional rights of slavery, we take that sacred instrument in its letter, we take it as expounded by the framers, and the succeeding generation of statesmen, and we find that the relation of servile labor is recognized, and to a certain extent its security guaranteed. We do not stop to ask whether the Federal Constitution adopted in 1787, accords with all the general doctrines of the Magna Charta of 1776, we find certain provisions in the bond of 1787, and we adhere to them. We will not agitate their repeal; we will frown down and if we can, we will *vote* down every party and every man who seeks to disturb the original bond of the American Union.

I repeat, we sustained Mr. Fillmore to rebuke and suppress the agitation of slavery by the Democratic party in Congress.

The responsibility of all our modern agitation which has been in the least alarming, lies at the door of the Democratic party. Let us consult history. The North has been anti-slavery in general sentiment, almost from the beginning of the government. But the Democratic and Whig parties kept up their organizations, and fought all their battles over monetary questions and questions of National industry and commerce, down to 1844. A few abolitionists petitioned earlier than that for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and after the settlement of the right of petition as a principle, they were powerless, and the merest fragment of the Northern opposition votes. The first great element of agitation, was the annexation of Texas, sought by Southern Democratic statesmen to increase the political power of slavery, and enhance the value of that relation of labor.

The Whig party of the North resisted it to a man. Mr. Webster was then at the height of his influence and power, and in the Senate and out of the Senate his mighty utterance was against the project, because it increased the number of slave States with the original inequalities ceded by the Constitution.

The Southern Whig party also resisted it, as a measure of the dominant party, if not because in sympathy with their Northern allies. The Democracy triumphed. Texas was admitted, and "agitation" was fairly inaugurated as one of our political divinities.

The next disturbance of the peace of the country was the Mexican war, carried on to secure new territory for the very same purpose that Texas was annexed—territory for more slave States. The project succeeded so far as the acquisition was concerned, but it did not work to the will of the authors. This Northern hive of freemen, the restless foot of whose adventure scales every height, traverses every desert, crosses every sea, to test every new source of wealth before any other part of the world has put on its sandels for the journey, had opened the golden gate of California, and crowned her with the evergreen wreath of freedom before the shackles were forged that were to bind her upon the altar of slavery. Another Minerva, she sprang full armed from the head of northern labor, and claimed to add another star to her country's ensign.

You know the subsequent history, the Compromise of 1850, which so divided for a time the country and parties. No matter who was right or who was wrong in their views of that settlement, it was made amid a storm of public passion which was many months in subsiding. But substantially it did subside. The greatest hostility to the measures was found in the Whig party north, who felt that California had a right to come in on her own merits, and that her admission should not form the basis of a compromise upon a series of questions. Many of you, with me, followed Mr. Clay then as we follow him now. I say the storm had substantially subsided when, in 1852, the Whig party and that portion of it, too, who had most strenuously resisted the Compromise measures, nominated for its Presidential candidate a supporter of those measures, General Scott, and placed him upon a platform which expressly declared that those compromise measures, "the act known as the Fugitive Slave Law included," were received and acquiesced in by the Whig party of the United States as a "*settlement* in principle and substance of the dangerous and exciting questions which they embrace." It further declared that it "deprecated all further agitation of the question thus settled."

General Scott, on this platform, received over one hundred and fifty thousand Whig votes in New York, while the whole abolition and anti-compromise vote was but a little over thirty thousand. It was a halcyon time, the winter of our discontent was passing away, "and the voice of the turtle was heard in the land." General Pierce came to the Presidential chair congratulating the country upon its repose, and referred in his Message to those measures as a final settlement of the slavery question. Pandora's box was hermetically sealed. An administration favorable to the measures was triumphantly in the ascendant, and it was in the power of the Democratic party to keep sealed that box, and to secure everlasting repose to the country on the slavery question; I mean so far as Congressional or State

legislative action is concerned. I do not believe there was a man at the North who hoped to create an anti-slavery party strong enough to get possession of, or any strong influence in the government, if the Democratic party made no new aggressive advance. If there was one such he would have been most signally disappointed. The occupation of agitators was gone, the country panted for repose. It felt its constitutional obligations, and was ready to obey them. There was no fuel to kindle new fires, and the old ones were fast being smothered in their own ashes.

The opposition to the Democratic party would soon have consolidated itself upon some basis, on industrial, or monetary or other questions. It was very plain sailing—the trouble was not to keep, but to break the peace. Now, gentlemen, in the winter of 1854 the winds were all loose again, the ocean was lashed into fury, and the widest spirits were riding, not directing, the storm.

The fatal box had been again opened, and Hope herself, this time, escaped.

Gentlemen, who let loose the winds? Who afresh fanned into flames that reached the heavens the passions of an infuriated people? Who was this time the arch AGITATOR? Whose was the sacrilegious hand that hurled into a fairer dome than that of Ephesus, the brand which kindled into devouring fire the division wall between Freedom and Slavery? Was it Senator Seward, or Giddings, or Garrison, or Sumner? It was the man who, in 1844, in a speech made at Carrolton, Illinois, is reported to have used these words of the noble author of the Missouri Compromise:

"Henry Clay is a *black-hearted traitor*, and the only American statesman who ever sold himself for British gold."

I quote from the "Peoria Democratic Union," his own organ, as I find it in "The World."

The man who now with hands dyed with the blood of more than five hundred American citizens who fell in the civil war of Kansas, conjured by his damnable spells, sues to the friends of Henry Clay to lift him out of his political deeps and stamp him with the royalty of patriotic statesmanship.

The man who after pouring the lowest abuse upon the American party, scoffing at it, railing at it like a very drab, now skulks about its carcass, which prays for friendly entombment, and begs that with its poor remains he may patch up his ladder to the Presidency. And I am sorry to say that the *debris* of the American party of New York is now so poor, is sunk so low from its former glory, that it has no higher office than that. A round in the ladder of Douglas' ambition. If he shall attain his purpose, he will surely to the ladder turn his back—

——"Scorning the base degrees
By which he did ascend."

I question no man's right of independent political action; I exercise it myself; but I do speak of the business of transferring the poor remains of the once noble American party to the bitterest enemy of all it has ever held sacred. As an American, who never asked of the party but one favor, that of serving it faithfully, with no reward save the consciousness of duty done —I wash my hands of it. If I wanted to support Mr. Douglas, I would do it, boldly, unapologetically. Never in masquerade, never in so thin a disguise as this which Ottendorfer has taught them to loathe.

We are on the subject of the democracy responsible for slavery agitation. I have shown you who re-opened the closed controversy. Douglas' and Pierce's administration, followed by Buchanan's attempt to force Slavery on Kansas by bayonet and fraudulent ballot—the Dred Scott decision, striking down with one fell swoop the common law doctrine in relation to slavery, and the Constitution, as established and interpreted by the Fathers and their successors, down to Pierce's Administration—the still bolder and constantly increasing demands for a Slave code, for intervention to protect slavery;—all these fresh elements of agitation are the witnesses to sustain my charge.

Now let me call a witness from abroad. In 1856 the American party North and South attempted to overthrow the Democratic party, because they agitated the slavery question.

I hold in my hand a copy of a letter of that noble old Whig and American, Kenneth Raynor, of North Carolina, written in October of 1856, to an American meeting in Pennsylvania. He says: —"It is the Democratic party leaders and their drill sergeants throughout the Union who are the authors of all the evils that now beset the country, growing out of the slavery question. It is no new thing with that party; it is an old game with them."

He proceeds to say that they saw the only chance of keeping power was to "get up another *furore* about slavery," and they found an opportunity in the organization of the territorial government in Kansas, and at the wave of the wand of the democratic magicians Slavery agitation rose in full panoply from the grave. "From that day to this," he says, "the country has had no peace; Slavery agitation rules the hour." Four years later I echo him, "From that day to this the country has had no peace; slavery agitation rules the hour."

This is one of hundreds of kindred testimony from Americans of the South, that the Democratic party is responsible for Slavery agitation. I bring another witness and the last one.

Our leader in 1856, Millard Fillmore, said in his letter to the Union meeting last winter, held in New York, "that the floods of evil now swelling and threatening to overthrow the Constitution and deluge this land with fraternal blood, were traceable"—to Stephen A. Douglas? "to this unfortunate act."—[Repeal of the Missouri Compromise.]

This was after the John Brown raid, and the attempt to fasten the responsibility of that mad project on the mere discussions of the institution of slavery by Northern Statesmen.

Let them call further witnesses who want them. You know, and I know, that Mr. Douglas called into being the Republican party. He exorcised a spirit of whose nature he knew little, when mad ambition led him to tear down that sacred rampart of freedom, while he let slip the dogs of war to ravage and desolate the plains of that territory. He may degrade the candidacy for the Presidency to as low a point as he will, by wandering over the country showing his wounds, and appealing to men whom he has spent his life in villifying. But he will learn from tens of thousands of such men as Richard W. Thompson, of Indianna, who participated in the nomination of Mr. Bell, and preferred his election to

that of any of the other candidates, but who is disgusted with the attempt to set Douglas on Mr. Bell's shoulders, and now declares, "*Mr. Bell shall never be elected by my consent, by a bargain with Mr. Douglas and his friends, or with Mr. Breckinridge and his friends.*" 'Tis an age of short memories, but Mr. Douglas's political past is not forgotten, and the great body of Americans will of this give him most emphatic evidence.

I think you now understand what I meant when I said that my support of Mr. Lincoln is the logical sequence of my support of Mr. Fillmore. I was then trying to rebuke and suppress agitation. The experiment proved that it could not be done in connection with our conservative Southern allies. The reign of terror which crushes out all freedom of political action at the South will not now permit of their union with the Northern opposition on affirmative grounds. We must first beat the Democracy.

The pressure was so great even in 1856, that at least fifty thousand men who should have voted for Mr. Fillmore, skulked under the wing of the democracy to avoid the stigma of supporting an Abolitionist.

The cry of mad dog was raised against Mr. Fillmore at the South, and he lost a half-dozen Southern States through the sheer cowardice of men who should have resisted the senseless howl. Themselves at heart opposed to slavery agitation, they sought refuge from the home storm in the camp of the agitators. I saw this timidity on the part of our Southern allies, in that campaign, and I forewarned them. I addressed a letter in the middle of September to an American journal in the South, which was widely published in our organs North and South, in which I used this language:

"We of the North, who stand by the constitutional rights of our southern brethren, but without abandoning our own, expect the same class of our southern brethren to stand with us in this crisis. * * * If the South shall conclude that their safety is in the arms of a southern sectional party, we of the North shall not mistake, nor shall we fail to improve the lesson. Northern conservatives deprecate sectional parties, but if such they must have, they will not go south of Mason-and-Dixon's line for political association. We shall fight on our own ground and for our own section. This is the first law of nature, and we need no instruction to obey it, save the force of example." Now, the great mass of conservatives of the South, were true in that campaign, but there were enough cowards among them to leave Mr. Fillmore high and dry on the beach in every Southern State, excepting gallant Maryland, demonstrating to my mind, that the business of redeeming the country, from democratic license, and of suppressing slavery agitation, must devolve, for once, on the Northern opposition. So I then said to our southern allies—so I now say and act.

Fiddling for Mr. Douglas, "the author of all our evils," as Mr. Fillmore tells us, holding up his skirt tails as he perambulates over the country in search of his mother, putting our necks under his feet that he may have altitude enough to reach the Presidency, is not my way of suppressing agitation or of rebuking agitators.

While I was thus prepared for a northern allegiance in the campaign of 1860, I never would have so allied myself, had the Republican party assumed a revolutionary or aggressive position toward the South. Their platform is entirely conservative, for it proposes to adhere to the old policy and to resist the new. It is substantially that of the Binghamton (American) platform. Its fourth resolution says, substantially, "You fifteen Southern States have your slavery; it is your business not ours. The government owes you protection against all invasion from without, and your own exclusive control over your institutions is just and necessary to maintain this Union, and to all your rights the Republican party pledges itself." Its other resolutions touching slavery, are but a re-affirmation of the life-long doctrines of Clay and Webster.

They have placed in nomination for the Presidency, a man who, deeply sympathizing with the central idea of the Republican party, preservation to freedom of territories now free, holds to every general conservative principle which we advocated in 1856.

He realizes, as we do, the necessity of a present union of the northern opposition to overthrow the reigning dynasty, but except as a necessity, this temporary separation of the opposition is not to his taste, more than it is to yours or mine. With that ingenuous, transparent truthfulness which seeks no concealments, he has expressed his views on this subject in his published speeches.

In his speech delivered at Cincinnati, in September, 1859, he says:

"There are plenty of men in the Slave States that are altogether good enough for me to be either President or Vice-President provided they will profess their sympathy with our purpose, and will place themselves on the ground that our men, upon principle can vote for them. I should be glad to have some of the many good, and able, and noble men of the South, to place themselves where we can confer upon them the high honor of an election upon one or the other end of the ticket. *It would do my soul good to do that thing.* It would enable us to teach them that, inasmuch as we select one of their own number to carry out our principles, *we are free from the charge that we mean more than we say.*"

Is that being cabined, cribbed and confined within the walls of a bigoted sectionalism?

Let me read one further extract from the same speech, for it reveals, as in a mirror, the whole head and heart of Abraham Lincoln on this question of slavery. He says:

"I say we must not interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists, because the Constitution forbids it, and the general welfare does not require us to do so. We must not withhold an efficient Fugitive Slave Law, because the Constitution requires us, as I understand it, not to withhold such a law. But we must prevent the outspreading of the institution, because neither the Constitution nor general welfare requires us to extend it. We must prevent the revival of the African slave trade, and the enacting by Congress of a Territorial Slave Code."

Such is Abraham Lincoln. It sounds like a passage from Clay or Webster, defining in terms so clear, so just, so bold and graphic, the constitutional rights and duties of the American people.

And yet with the Chicago platform before them, with Lincoln's avowed national sentiments before them, the charge is made that "aboli-

tion" is the central purpose the vital energising force of the Republican party, and this by men who ought o know better.

Mr. Lincoln, I believe, will be elected President by the people, and yet if he had avowed himself in favor of aggressive movements against slavery in the States, he could not receive a single electoral vote. I go further, and say that if, when elected, he should turn his administration into one of abolition propagandism, if he should falsify the Chicago platform, and seek, not fairly to carry out the avowed purposes of the Republican party, but to build up a Northern aggressive, slavery-agitation party, his administration would sink even to a lower deep than Mr. Buchanan's has reached. He would not have a score of members of Congress from the whole North to sustain him.

He will receive at least two hundred and fifty thousand votes in the State of New York from men who would rise in their indignation to overwhelm his administration and his treasonable advisers.

The seventy-five thousand supporters of Mr. Fillmore in 1856, now supporting Mr. Lincoln in New York, would lead the van of that army of men who would rise to hurl him from power. I know the case is not supposable, for Lincoln has the royal impress of an honest man on his soul, and the union of these States by the maintenance of all the Constitutional rights of all its interests and sections, is the master-passion of his political nature. Nevertheless, I use this method of saying what I know—that the Republican party could not live an hour, would be as poor and contemptible as the Garrison party of Abolitionists, if it should come into power with a lie in its right hand, on this question of preserving, in good faith, the balances of the Constitution.

But are there not orators in the Republican party who are full of bitterness and denunciation of the South, and of their institutions? Certainly there are a few men; about three or four names are generally served up to us by our Bell-Union friends, of that stamp. But what has that to do with the administration of Mr. Lincoln?

They dwell on the horrible side of slavery, until it broods over their souls like a hideous nightmare, and they serve up to us a dish of atrocities every time they open their lips. I confess it is not to my taste, and I know little of their speeches, save from report. I have learned more of that class of speeches, from that retired but cultivated and most excellent gentleman, the Hon. Daniel D. Barnard, who seems to have a morbid passion for groping about in the charnel house, when he could feed on the fair mountains and in the green valleys where Abram Lincoln would lead him, than from all other sources. He has made a comprehensive paper of "Elegant Extracts," from that class of Philipics. I should as soon think of gathering up the mad and treasonable rhetoric of Keitt and laying it at the door of Breckinridge. There are all sorts of temperaments in the Republican party. It has been on the defensive for six years, resisting aggressions every hour. The accomplished Sumner, elected by a coalition of Abolitionists and Democrats, to the Senate, has deep private griefs to stimulate his natural hate of slavery; while the earnest and eloquent Lovejoy hears the voice of his brother crying from the ground, calling upon him to avenge his martyrdom.

There is another class, philosophic thinkers, who discuss this question of labor North and South, and its relation to capital, and a few of their aphorisms have almost frightened our "Union" friends out of their senses. Senator Seward at the North, and Senator Hunter at the South, are the leading representatives of this class. Both scholars, both philosophic, calm, earnest thinkers. The one thinks free labor the best system in all latitudes; the other thinks the servile relation best, certainly in the planting States. The one concurs with Jefferson, who seems to me to be the political father of Senator Seward, for I know of no man who so completely mirrors him in his general views of society, and the relations and rights of individual man; while the other thinks Jefferson was in error, and devotes himself to educating over again the Southern mind. Now I need not say in this presence that I do not concur in all the abstract notions of either of these gentlemen. I have for twenty years differed with Mr. Seward in opinion upon some questions. I gave him my first vote for Governor; I wrote in his behalf my first newspaper article more than twenty years ago; yet I soon discovered that upon some questions we did not concur, but they were questions about which men ever have differed and ever will differ, and, generally of an abstract character.

But I never saw the day when I did not believe that Mr. Seward, if called to the Presidency, would administer the government on this very question upon a basis which the whole country would deem entirely just, national, wise and patriotic. He may think, as a philosopher, that there is an "irrepressible conflict" between the two systems of labor, and the Democractic party is certainly doing all in its power to justify the opinion, and that one or the other must prevail universally. But I see no more harm in this abstract opinion when uttered by Seward than when uttered by Jefferson, with whom he concurs. The question is, what policy would Mr. Seward advise as a Republican leader, so far as he could influence it—not what abstract opinion does he entertain of the future of slavery. I do not think there is an intelligent Bell-Everett man in the State of New York who believes he would advise any aggressive action upon the Southern States, or upon their constitutional safeguards. Mr. Seward is undoubtedly a bold thinker, but his whole life and whole character impress upon me the conviction that in action, with governmental responsibilities on his shoulders, he would be as conservative as justice could ask. Radical abstract thought and conservative practical action, are by no means incompatible.

I have said this much of a few of the Republican leaders, because of the attempt to use their names as nurses do stories of ghosts, to frighten children.

We never hear of Mr. Corwin, or Edward Bates, or of any of that school of Republicans, from our alarmists. I don't believe we shall find them quoting a late article of the Courier & Inquirer, Mr. Seward's most intimate, personal and devoted organ, in which it declares that the negro is better off in present slavery, than he would be in a state of freedom, and that it is opposed to his emancipation without expatriation.

The discussion of issues I shall leave to those who follow me. Indeed, you have already formed your opinions, or you would not be here

enrolling yourself under the Lincoln banner. You are determined upon resisting in the only feasible way the revolutionary doctrines inaugurated by Mr. Douglas. You believe the system of free labor to be now, and in all future time, best for the white race, best for humanity. You will seek to preserve our territories and our present Free States for that system of labor. The State of Texas, now enveloped with incendiary fires, its citizens butchered by brutal force, and, more horrible still, its women violated by savage heat, oppressive fear and danger everywhere, the legitimate fruits of a system which ignores the principle of personal freedom, is an argument more persuasive than all the rhetoric in the universe, in favor of bestowing upon the labor of any State the right of life, liberty and the pur suit of happiness. You will not build our future empire on the crater of a Vesuvius, when you can find the solid rock or the firm earth for a foundation.

I notice your call, among other reasons for your action, expresses the impossibility of electing Mr. Bell. You honor Mr. Bell as a man and a statesman. So do I, and never until now has my political action been severed from his. But, gentlemen, he has no distinct party at the North, and the only hope of his friends is to defeat an election by the people, and throw the Presidency into that boiling cauldron, the House of Representatives. They chaffer and bargain here with Douglas, in New Jersey with Breckinridge, anywhere with anybody, friends or foes, "black spirits or while, blue spirits or gray," who will give them a coalition. In this state they are tickled with ten electors for Mr. Bell, and then create twenty-five to let Douglas swallow up the ten. No calamity could befall the country equal to that which would ensue from throwing the election into Congress.

The genius of jobs would preside, and corruption unparalleled, undermining all public confidence in official purity, and sending its demoralizing influence down through every grade of official station, and even into the ranks of the people, poisoning all the fountains of our political life, would be the most necessary result. It is an experiment upon the public morality we cannot afford. Let somebody be elected by the College, let Lincoln go to the wall if anybody else is stronger with the people—only save us the perils which thicken around this Congressional experiment.

Gentlemen. I end as I began, by saying that I want an end to this negro agitation. If the democratic party will stop legislating in Congress and in the Supreme Court about the negro, we will go to legislating for the white man. If they will stop agitating and leave us alone, the negro will sink out of sight as a political character. We know he is of an inferior race, inferior normally, inferior by force of circumstances which press down upon him heavily at the north as well as at the south. He is under the social mill stone, and so far as his status in society is concerned, he is everywhere at the bottom, and persistently kept there. If there is any creature I pity in the world, it is the negro. In his native land he is the victim of civil wars—without any opportunity for elevation above the lowest grade of barbarism. Stolen from his tropical home, he is the victim of the heartless cupidity of the white man—driven into the slave shambles, robbed of every blessing of a personal freedom—In the slave State he has no home, and by law, no wife, no children, no name, no life but task work for another. At the north, it is a little better, yet he is here by the social law driven out of every employ that would give him fellowship with white labor. He whitewashes walls, and once shaved our faces; but this is now denied him. The white man has turned barber. He cannot eat with us, nor worship God with us, nor receive his education with us. If he learns a mechanic's trade, and enters a shop to sell his skill for bread, every white man drops his tool, and "you leave, or I must," is the universal cry.

I am not complaining. I am stating facts—exhibiting to you the fruits of a social law which at the North has the force of an instinct. Give to the negro what you will, so long as he occupies his present relation to northern society, you will give him but a stone for bread and a scorpion for fish. Remove from him this mountain of prejudice which all men feel, the most humane as well as the most unfeeling, a prejudice which places the negro beyond the possibility of social or citizen elevation, and you will do him a service—a service which, until your instincts are changed, will never be done him. In the midst of the white race he is an inferior in every relation, bond or free, the slave of caste if not of law. Yet this is no reason why we should enslave him, no reason why we should demoralize our own posterity by establishing the institution of slavery over our western domain. It is a reason why we should treat with charity and tenderness these children of our Common Father—why, in every way which Christian philanthropy dictates and the law of our nature admits, we should seek his moral and social elevation.

It is the office of a powerful Christian State

> To civilize the rude, unpolished world
> And lay it under the restraint of laws.
> To make man mild and sociable to man,
> To cultivate the wild, licentious savage
> With wisdom, discipline and l beral arts.
> The embellishments of life. Virtues like these
> Make human nature shine, reform the soul
> And break our fierce barbarians into men.

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS.—No. 14.

SPEECH

OF

CARL SCHURZ,

AT COOPER INSTITUTE,

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1860.

Douglasism Exposed and Republicanism Vindicated.

Fellow-Citizens: This meeting is called to ratify the nominations of your State Convention. I am a stranger among you, and have no immediate interest in the affairs of your State; but nevertheless I can tell you that the citizens of my State ratify your nominations as heartily as you do. [Cheers.] In the nomination of Morgan and Campbell they see the guaranty of a glorious victory in November. [Applause.] You do not expect me to speak about State affairs. I will, therefore, at once turn your attention to national topics. [Cheers.] I may draw heavily upon your patience. I hope you will bear with me. [Cheers.]

A Voice—We'll stand it three hours. [Laughter.]

In a contest of great principles, like that which is now agitating the country, I am little inclined to discuss the personal qualities of candidates; but, when the individual merits of a man are set up as his principal claim to the highest and most responsible office in the Republic, it is natural that we should feel obliged to examine his history and character with more than ordinary care.

It is a notorious fact that the friends of Judge Douglas in the Northern States solicit the vote of the people on the ground that he has done more for the freedom of the Territories, and that he is a truer champion of free labor, and besides, a greater statesman, than any living individual. Thus a personal issue is urged upon us, and we are ready to accept it. This will be the subject of my remarks to-night. I shall not transgress the limits of propriety, but I am determined to call things by their right names.

What is it that entitles Judge Douglas to the high-sounding appellation, "the Champion of Freedom," or "the greatest of living statesmen?" Is it his past career, or is it his present position? You can survey the history of this "Champion of Freedom" at a single glance. The Judge has his Free-Soil record—what Northern Pro-Slavery man has not? But there is hardly a prominent man in political life who has taken more pains than he to disclaim and apologize for his early Anti-Slavery sentiments. So we may drop this subject. What follows is more instructive.

In 1820, the Missouri Compromise was framed as a sacred compact between the two sections of the Union. By virtue of that Compromise, Missouri was admitted as a Slave State, and Arkansas as a Slave State; and thus the free North, as one party to the contract, paid down its price for the Slavery prohibition north of 36° 30'. Was Mr. Douglas ever heard to express any doubt as to the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise so long as it served to augment the number of Slave States? It was to him, as to all others, "a sacred and inviolable compact"—as sacred and inviolable as the Constitution itself; and he cursed the "ruthless hand" that would dare to break it down. When, after the Mexican war, the Territories acquired for this Union were to be organized, he was among the first and foremost who advocated the extension of the Missouri line across the whole continent. What would have been the result of that measure? In the Territories acquired from Mexico Slavery was abolished and prohibited by local legislation, but the extension of the Missouri line was calculated to admit Slavery into all that part of it which lies south of 36° 30'. Mark well: So long as the Missouri Compromise served to introduce Slave States, he did not dream of its unconstitutionality. When by the extension of the Missouri line free territory could be converted into slave territory, he found it so eminently convenient, so excellent an arrangement, that he not only proposed to preserve it in its original ex-

☞For Sale at the Office of the Albany Evening Journal. Price, per Single Copy, 2c.; per Dozen Copies, 20c.; per Hundred, $1; per Thousand, $8.

tent, but to run it across the whole continent to the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

But now the time arrives when Free States are to grow up under the guaranties of the same Missouri Compromise. A new light dawns upon Judge Douglas. He rises in the Senate Chamber, and asserts that the Territory north of the Missouri line can no longer be exempted from Slavery, because the exclusion of Slavery from it—the very condition on which Missouri was admitted as a Slave State—was at war with the fundamental principles of the Constitution. The same man who had cursed as ruthless, the hand that would violate the Missouri Compromise, as long as that compact was beneficial to Slavery, tore it down *with his own hands* as soon as it was to serve the interests of Free Labor. And he is the truest "Champion of Freedom!" How wonderful a change! At the time when he proposed the extension of the Missouri line to the Pacific Ocean, he was either convinced of the unconstitutionality of that compromise, or he was not. If he was, how could he conscientiously propose the extension and perpetuation of a measure which he considered a crime against the Constitution? Were his conscience and his convictions hushed into silence by the interests of Slavery? Or if he was not, how did it come to pass that he became so suddenly convinced of that unconstitutionality the very moment that the preservation and execution of that Compromise would have advanced the interests of free labor? How did it happen that his convictions, in all their prompt and wonderful transformations, always coincided so admirably with the interests of Slavery? This is indeed a most astonishing coincidence, and I leave it to your sagacity to draw your conclusions.

But Mr. Douglas is still the "True Champion of Free Labor;" for it is asserted that the Nebraska bill—the same measure which breaks down the barriers to Slavery—will by that very operation introduce Free Labor into the Territories. The thing is speedily brought to a practical test. No sooner is the Nebraska bill enacted and the Missouri restriction struck down, than Emigrant Aid Societies are organized in the Slave States, especially in Missouri, for the purpose of introducing Slavery into Kansas. The history of the Blue Lodges is familiar to you. Lawless bands of armed invaders pour into Kansas, take possession of the ballot-boxes, bowie-knife and revolver in hand, and control the elections by fraud and violence. Did Mr. Douglas ever utter a word of reproach or condemnation against the Border Ruffians of Missouri? Did he not most tenderly excuse their atrocities on the plea of self-defense, while it was a notorious fact that their organization had preceded that of the Free-State men? *And, mark well, that immigration was Pro-Slavery.*

Other Emigrant Aid Societies are organized in the Northern States. Large numbers of men go to Kansas, armed, indeed, for self-defense, as every pioneer will be, but with the *bona fide* intention of settling down upon the soil of that territory as permanent inhabitants; and while burning houses and trails of blood mark the track of the Border Ruffians, flourishing farms and industrious towns spring up under the hands of the Free-State men. Do you remember how often Judge Douglas emptied the vials of his wrath, and cast denunciations upon the heads of Free Labor immigration? *And, mark well, that immigration was Anti Slavery.*

A Legislature is set up by a band of lawless invaders—mostly Missourians—set up by the most atrocious violations of the ballot-box, set up in defiance of all the rules of constitutional government; that Legislature adopts the slave-code of Missouri as the laws of Kansas, and adds to them laws so outrageous in their nature that even Northern Democrats quailed under the opprobrium. Do you remember that Judge Douglas recognized that Legislature, although its criminal origin was manifest to all, as the highest law-giving authority of the Territory, and the laws enacted by them, although known to be the offspring of fraud and violence, as the valid laws of Kansas? Do you remember how he denounced every one who would not submit as a rebel and a traitor? And, mark well, that Legislature and those laws were *Pro-Slavery.* The Free State settlers of Kansas, then evidently a large majority of the population, go to work and frame a Constitution. That Constitution was gotten up in a way hardly more irregular than the Constitutions of many States. It was submitted to a vote of the people, and adopted by a large majority. So it was presented to Congress. Do you remember that Judge Douglas found no term of denunciation too vile to use it against that Constitution, and that he stigmatized those who had framed it as traitors who must be struck down? And, mark well, that Constitution, the choice of the people of Kansas, was *Anti-Slavery.*

What a series of wonderful coincidences! So far, whatever was calculated to benefit Slavery in Kansas, Judge Douglas was sure to approve; whatever was calculated to serve the cause of Free Labor, Judge Douglas was sure to denounce. But I must not forget that he brought forward other reasons for his acts than the interest of Slavery. Ah, indeed! Is it so extraordinary that a man of ability, who stoops to do a mean act, should have wit enough to disguise it? Compare his plausibilities with these coincidences, and you will with me come to the conclusion that this "Champion of Free Labor," if he really was an enemy to Slavery, loved his enemies much better than a good Christian ought to do.

But we will be just to him. Now we arrive at a period in his history in which he seems to have acquired some title to the esteem of his countrymen. We are so little accustomed to see that kind of statesmen do a fair thing, that our surprise is apt to stimulate our gratitude. I allude to the position assumed by Judge Douglas in the struggle about the Lecompton Constitution. A packed Convention has framed a Constitution, fastening Slavery upon Kansas, and refuses to submit it to a vote of the people. The President, in a message, urges the admission of Kansas as a State, under that Constitution as it stands. Judge Douglas, together with the Republicans, resists the measure; not, indeed, because he is opposed to Slavery—for he solemnly and emphatically protests that he "does not care whether Slavery be voted up or voted down;" but because it is uncertain whether the Lecompton Constitution embodies the will of the people. The slave power is arrayed against him, and for the first time in his life the claim of his being a "Champion of Freedom" seems to rise from the level of a ridiculous absurdity. I should feel little tempted to detract from the credit he gained

by his attitude on that occasion, if the facts which preceded and followed it were not of so unmistakable a nature as to open our eyes to the peculiar concatenation of circumstances which made it almost impossible for him to act otherwise.

And here again we notice a series of most striking coincidences. It so happened that just about the time when the Lecompton question was before Congress, Douglas's term as a United States Senator was about to expire. He knew well that his popularity at home rested upon the popular belief that he really did work for the cause of Free Labor. How stupid must the man have been not to see that, saddled with the Lecompton Constitution, it would have been impossible for him to keep up that delusion. So he assumed the mask of an advocate of popular rights, coquetted with the Republicans in order to disarm their opposition, and went before the people of Illinois as a candidate for re-election to the Senate. What right have I to speak of his assuming a mask? I have that right, if I can show that he threw it off as soon as his object was gained.

Review his acts in connection with the Kansas struggle. Slavery and Free Labor had for years waged their fierce war about that unfortunate Territory with doubtful success. Now at last no sane man could any longer close his eyes against the fact, that when the Lecompton outrage was perpetrated, the Free State men outnumbered their opponents almost ten to one. Their victory might be delayed, but was no longer doubtful. How had Douglas acted so long as Slavery had a chance to gain the preponderance? Need I remind you of the unwavering solicitude with which he defended the Border Ruffians; of the fierceness with which he denounced the Free State immigration; of the virulence with which he upheld the Border Ruffian code of laws; of the promptness with which he put his foot upon the law of the people expressed in the Free State Constitution; of his brutal, cynic sneer at the agonies of a people in distress? Was the election of the Border Ruffian Legislature, the enactment of the Border Ruffian code of laws, a less flagrant violation of popular rights than the Lecompton Constitution? How could he uphold the former, and claim any credit for opposing the latter? Here is another most wonderful coincidence. Just so long as Slavery had a chance in Kansas, Douglas stood upon the side of Slavery. But no sooner was the victory of Freedom sure, than Douglas was sure to stand upon the strongest side.

And now he is held up to our admiration as the "True Champion of Freedom." After having done more than any other man in perpetrating the outrage, what merit is there in helping to prevent its final consummation, when it has become manifest that, *in spite of him*, that consummation has become impossible? Look at it. The Nebraska bill, as I heard my friend Grimshaw in Illinois illustrate it, had set fire to the edifice of Territorial Liberty. The Republican fire companies are vigorously at work; the Republican engines are playing with full force, and then comes the very incendiary, Douglas, with a little tea-spoonful of Anti-Lecompton water, throws it into the flames, and then swells himself up and claims to have extinguished the conflagration—and so he goes before the people of Illinois as the "True Champion of Freedom."

And this he would hardly have had the courage to do, had not, as is now known to all of us, the indignant threats of the gallant Broderick overawed him when he was about to compromise with Buchanan.

I repeat, I would never stoop to question the motives which actuated him in the Lecompton struggle, had not the acts which preceded it made his honesty doubtful; and had not those that followed it precluded all belief in the sincerity of his repentance. If he was honest, you will be obliged to confess, it is exceedingly hard to prove it on him.

On the strength of this exploit he succeeded in carrying his point in Illinois; not indeed by a popular majority, for that was against him, but by an old Gerrymandering apportionment. It was one of those lugubrious victories, which consist in a narrow escape from total annihilation. But his seat is regained; and now he throws a wistful eye upon a higher seat; and remembers at once that the Democratic road to the White House leads through the slaveholding States. So he turns his face Southward without delay, and sets out on a trip down the Mississippi. He is at once betrayed into making a few remarks, here and there, to spontaneous gatherings. Suddenly we find the man who had tried to delude the people of Illinois into the belief that under the Kansas and Nebraska bill, the people had a right to exclude slavery, in the South busily apologising for it; and now behold the old Douglas again wielding the weapon of sophistry with unblushing boldness, and endeavoring to make his doctrine of Popular Sovereignty palatable to the Southern stomach.

The development of the Popular Sovereignty doctrine is one of the most instructive chapters in the history of our days. It shows how easily the popular mind can be obfuscated by a sophistical plausibility, and how easily correct principles are lost sight of in the confused struggle of interests and aspirations. Future generations will scrutinize, with curious astonishment the history of our days, and wonder at the temporary success of so transparent a fraud. Permit me a brief digression.

Popular Sovereignty, in the true sense of the term, means the sovereignty of all individuals, so regulated by law as to protect the rights and liberties of any one against the encroachments of any other, and so organized by political institutions as to give a common expression to the collective will. Its natural basis is the equality of the rights of all men. Its natural end is the protection of all individuals in the exercise of their rights and in the enjoyment of their liberties. Hence it precludes the idea of Slavery in all its forms. Apply this true Popular Sovereignty to the Territories, and we are willing to accept it—nay, it is the very thing which we are contending for. But is this what Douglas, in the Nebraska bill, contemplated? By no means. His Popular Sovereignty is based upon the assumption that one class of men has the power—has the right—to strip another class of their natural rights, and to hold them as slaves.

For argument sake, let us follow him in his course of reasoning, and suppose the white population of the Territories had the right to hold a portion of the inhabitants as property. So, we have to lower the standard of Popular Sovereignty one degree! Listen to the language of the Kansas and Nebraska bill:

"It is the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate Slavery into any State or Territory, nor to exclude

it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

At first, one would suppose this bill gave the people of the Territories the sovereign right to introduce Slavery, provided, always, that Slavery could not go there unless introduced by a positive act of Territorial legislation. Is that what Douglas's principle of Popular Sovereignty contemplated? By no means! For, according to him, a slaveholder may introduce his slave property, and thereby introduce and establish Slavery in a Territory without that positive act of Territorial legislation.

We have, therefore, to lower the standard of Popular Sovereignty another degree! One would suppose that, Slavery so being admitted at first, the people of the Territory would have at least the sovereign right to remove and exclude it by a positive act of Territorial legislation. Is that what Judge Douglas's principle of Popular Sovereignty contemplated? By no means! He told you at first that this was a question to be decided by the Supreme Court, then he told you that the sovereignty of a Territory remains in abeyance, suspended in the United States; in trust for the people until they shall be admitted into the Union as a State; and, at last, after the Illinois campaign, he dropped the expression, "excluding Slavery," altogether. It is siguificant that the attempts of the people of Nebraska and Kansas to exclude Slavery by law, were promptly put down by the vetoes of the Governors of those Territories; vetoes exercised by virtue of the power conferred on the Territorial Governments by Douglas's own Nebraska bill.

Thus we have descended two great steps from the true idea of Popular Sovereignty, without having reached Judge Douglas's great principle; and you will perceive that the true Popular Sovereignty has already disappeared long ago. But let us lower the standard of Popular Sovereignty still another degree, and we may hope that the deeper we sink the closer we may approach Judge Douglas's position. At last we find him not with a principle but with an assumption. It matters not, said he in his Freeport speech in August, 1858:

"It matters not what way the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question, whether Slavery may go or may not go into a Territory under the Constitution, the people have the lawful means to introduce it, or exclude it, as they please; for the reason that Slavery cannot exist a day or an hour anywhere unless it is supported by local police regulations. Those police regulations can only be established by the local legislature, and if the people are opposed to Slavery they will elect representatives to that body who will, by unfriendly legislation, prevent the introduction of it into their midst."

This then is the great principle of Popular Sovereignty. It contemplates, not the general exercise and enjoyment of equal rights; not that Slavery cannot go into a Territory unless the people introduce it by law; not that the people have the sovereign right to exclude it by a direct act of Territorial legislation; but that they may annoy and embarrass the slaveholder in the enjoyment of his slave property, so as to *tease* Slavery out of the Territory if they can. If, ten years ago, a man had undertaken to call this Popular Sovereignty, the people would have suspected him of serious mental derangement. Is not really this kind of Popular Sovereignty, according to Mr. Lincoln's striking illustration, "as thin as the "homœopathic soup that was made by boiling "the shadow of a pigeon that had been starved "to death?" It would seem impossible to make it any thinner, and yet Mr. Douglas undertakes this incredible task. After having tried to delude the voters of Illinois into the belief that consistently with his position, the people of the Territory may, in some round-about way, remove Slavery, this "True Champion of Freedom" goes South and proves there that Slavery has a legal existence in the Territories. We find him at New Orleans, and the same man who at Freeport had told the people of Illinois that it mattered not what the Supreme Court might decide, as to the abstract question, whether Slavery may or may not go into a Territory—the same man speaks to the people of Louisiana as follows:

"I, in common with the Democracy of Illinois, accept the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Dred Scott, as an authoritative interpretation of the Constitution. In accordance with that decision, we hold that slaves are property; and hence on an equal footing with other property, and the owner of the slave has the same right to move into a Territory, and carry his slave property with him, as the owner of any other property has to go there and carry his property."

If there could be any misunderstanding as to the meaning of this sentence, he has removed the possibility of it by an expression he used in debate in the Senate on the 23d of February, 1859:

"Slaves, according to the Dred Scott decision, being property, stand on an equal footing with all other kinds of property; and there is just as much obligation on the part of the Territorial Legislature to protect slaves, as every other species of property, as there is to protect horses, cattle, dry goods and liquors."

And mark well, Judge Douglass never forgets the *liquors!* There is Douglas, the candidate for the Senatorship of Illinois, who does not care what way the Supreme Court may decide; and here is Douglas, the candidate for the Presidency, who declares the decision of the Supreme Court to be the authoritative interpretation of the Constitution.

What then did the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case decide? Let me quote from Howard's official report some of the points laid down in that case:

"Every citizen has a right to take with him into the Territory any article of property which the Constitution of the United States recognizes as property."

"The Constitution of the United States recognizes slaves as property, and pledges the Federal Government to defend it."

"That act of Congress, therefore, prohibiting a citizen of the United States taking with him his slaves when he removes into the Territory in question to reside, is an act of authority over the private property which is thus warranted by the Constitution."

"While it remains a Territory Congress may legislate over it within the scope of its constitutional powers in relation to citizens of the United States, and may establish a Territorial Government, and the form of the local government must be regulated by the direction of Congress, but with powers not exceeding those which Congress itself, by the Constitution, is authorized to exercise over the citizens of the United States in respect to the rights of property."

If this needs any illustration, I may furnish it by quoting a few more sentences from the decision:

"No word can be found in the Constitution which gives Congress power over slave property, or entitles property of that kind to less protection than property of any other description; *only the power conferred is the power coupled with the duty of guarding and protecting the owner in his rights.*"

This, then, is what Douglas calls the authoritative interpretation of the Constitution, and he well understands what it means; for did he not say that there is just as much obligation on the part of the Territorial Legislature to protect property in slaves as there is to protect any other species of property? Well, but what becomes of his great principle of Popular Sovereignty?

What becomes even of that homœopathic dilution called unfriendly legislation? Congress can, according to the Dred Scott decision, which Douglas acknowledges to be "the authoritative interpretation of the Constitution," confer no power which itself does not possess. The only power it possesses in regard to slave property is the power of guarding and protecting the owner in his rights, and that power is coupled with the duty to do so. Hence the only power Congress can confer upon the Territorial Government, in relation to slave property, is the power coupled with the duty of guarding and protecting the owner in his rights.

Thus we are obliged to lower the standard of Popular Sovereignty still another degree, in order to reach Douglas's great principle. It does not even consist in the right of the people to tease Slavery out of a Territory; it consists in the power of a Territorial Legislature, coupled with the duty, to pass acts for the protection of Slavery, but by no means against it. The assumed power to pass unfriendly laws seems to be changed into the duty to pass friendly laws. I call this Popular Sovereignty with a vengeance! It is like mock turtle soup—there is soup enough, but not a particle of turtle.

It is true, Judge Douglas was in the habit of quibbling a little about the meaning of the Dred Scott decision; and the Wickliffe resolution adopted by his friends at Baltimore has helped him over his difficulties. It is to the following effect:

"*Resolved*, That it is in accordance with the true interpretation of the Cincinnati platform, that, during the existence of a Territorial Government, the *measure of restriction*, whatever it may be, imposed by the Federal Constitution on the powers of the Territorial Legislatures, over the subject of domestic relations, *as the same has been or may hereafter be finally determined by the Supreme Court of the United States*, shall be respected by good citizens *and enforced with promptness and fidelity* by every branch of the Federal Government."

To all of which Judge Douglas, in his letter of acceptance, most graciously assents.

We hear no longer of the "rights of the people "of the Territories to form and regulate their "domestic institutions in their own way," but now, "of the measure of restrictions imposed "upon the Territorial Legislatures over the sub-"ject of domestic relations." The change is very significant; whatever these restrictions, they are, or may hereafter be, finally determined by the Supreme Court of the United States. Let me remind you that previous to the election of Mr. Buchanan, whenever the question was put as to the right of property in slaves under the new Territorial Government, Judge Douglas's regular reply was "that is a question for Congress to "decide." That answer was the forerunner of the Dred Scott decision. We are now told "as "shall hereafter be finally determined by the Su-"preme Court of the United States." What will follow? The restriction, already finally determined, we know; it is, that Government cannot impair the right of property, in slaves; but has the power, coupled with the duty, to protect and guard the owner in his rights. "Restrictions which may hereafter be "finally determined!" Heaven knows what they will be. But, "what-"ever they may be" Douglas is pledged to enforce them "with promptness and fidelity."

So it turns out that his Popular Sovereignty fastens Slavery more irremovable upon a Territory as such, than it is fastened upon South Carolina herself. The people of South Carolina in their sovereign capacity may abolish Slavery whenever they see fit. The people of Kansas in their Territorial condition cannot. The people of South Carolina have the right to discourage Slavery by unfriendly legislation; the people of Kansas are bound to guard and protect the slave-owner in his rights, and are restricted from passing laws violating that obligation. The Federal Government has no power to interfere in South Carolina, but as soon as Kansas dares to disregard the "restriction," Judge Douglas, if he should become President of the United States, would stand pledged to enforce that restriction "with "promptness and fidelity." And after having struck down the freedom of the Territories, this "Champion of Freedom" will sneak behind the judicial despotism of the Supreme Court, and like the murderer of Banquo, tell you that "Thou canst not say I did it!"

But I say *he did do it*. The character of his doctrine of Popular Sovereignty was determined by the decision of the question, whether or not slave property, as such, could be introduced into a Territory before Slavery was established there by a positive act of Territorial legislation. If this question was decided in the affirmative the doctrine that Slavery, as the creature of local law, was totally abandoned. If Slavery could exist in a Territory without being established by local law, then it existed there by a law higher than local law, and that could be no other than the Constitution of the United States. In this case every sane man must see that then Slavery cannot be removed from a Territory by a mere act of the Territorial legislature, whether direct or indirect; and Mr. Douglas need not affect any surprise at the doctrines his Southern opponents hold. They are the natural, the legitimate, the logical offspring of his own position. When he conceded that all-important point—and he did concede it—this "Champion of Freedom" was either aware of the consequence, or he was not. If he was not, he is liable to the charge of gross stupidity; if he was, he is liable to the charge of deliberate betrayal of the cause of Free Labor, covered with the grossest hypocrisy. In what character do you like your "Champion of Freedom" best? As one who has not sagacity enough to defend it, or as one who deliberately betrays it? There are cases where stupidity is no less criminal than hypocrisy.

This, then, is the "great principle of Popular Sovereignty." This is "leaving the people to "form and regulate their own domestic institu-"tions in their own way." I am warranted in saying that, if ever a gigantic, unscrupulous, shameless fraud was attempted upon a free people—if history ever furnished an example of unblushing, scandalous, revolting hypocrisy, it is this "True Champion of Freedom;" to fasten Slavery irremovably upon the Territories, and calling it "leaving the people perfectly free to "regulate their own domestic institutions!"—to strip the people of every right to regulate their own affairs, and to call it Popular Sovereignty! Strike the word "demagoguism" out of your dictionaries if you do not want to apply it here. But, although we may understand how inordinate, desperate ambition should resort to such frauds, it remains truly wonderful that so many thousands have suffered themselves to be deceived by them.

Is it surprising that the "Champion of Freedom" who defends such theories should be fouud a little unreliable in practice? How clamorous

he was against the Lecompton Constitution! What a terrible idea, that a Territory should be forced into the Union as a State with a Constitution not approved by the people! At last the people of Kansas frame a new Constitution; it is submitted to the people; it is approved by a large majority. All conditions of admission rigorously complied with, they knock at the Union, and we expect to see our "True Champion of Freedom" rush to the rescue with unabated zeal —for his great point is gained. But where is Douglas? The House of Representatives votes in favor of the admission; the decision of the question depends upon the action of the Senate. The matter is referred to the Committee on Territories. That Committee consists of seven members. Douglas is one of them; but he does not attend their meetings. The vote of the Committee stands 3 to 3. Douglas's vote can decide the question in the Committee, in favor of the admission of Kansas. It is well known how far the action of a Committee goes to determine the action of the Senate; but Douglas does not vote! The question remains in this suspended state for some time. The country looks for the action of the Committee; the action of the Committee is blocked by a tie; but Douglas does not vote! Douglas who had declared so fiercely against the admission under a Constitution which the people *did not want*, does not vote when the admission is applied for with a Constitution which the people *do* want. Douglas, the "True Champion of Freedom," holding the fate of Free Kansas in that Committee in his hands, Douglas does not vote! How is this? When he opposed the Lecompton Constitution he was a candidate for reëlection to the Senate. But things have changed since. Douglas now acts as a candidate for the Presidency. The same man who in 1857 had to propitiate the Free people of Illinois, has now to propitiate the people of the South; and instead of deciding the report of the Committee in favor of the admission of Kansas as a Free State, he is busily engaged in preparing his 15th of May speech, which is to convince the slaveholders that his great principle of Popular Sovereignty is working favorably for the introduction of Slave States—the Free State of Kansas is kept out of the Union once more and he is held up as the "True Champion of Freedom." Poor Freedom —then the Champion's belt lies like a halter around her neck.

Here I will stop. I might go on for hours, piling fact upon fact, conclusion upon conclusion, argument upon argument, until the putrid accumulation of fraud and hypocrisy, exposed to the sunlight, would torture your very nostrils. It is enough. I will dismiss Mr. Douglas, "the True Champion of Freedom," and devote a few remarks to Mr. Douglas, "the greatest of livingstatesmen."

True statesmanship can rest upon no other basis but an intimate familiarity with the philosophy of Government, and a thorough knowledge of the sources and effects of political institutions. It can have no other aim and end but the conservation of sound constitutional principles and their application most favorable to the development of popular liberty. Let us see how "the greatest of living statesmen" stands the test. I shall confine myself to a few facts of vital importance.

It is one of the striking peculiarities of our Federal polity that the different branches of our General Government enjoy a certain independence in the exercise of the functions respectively assigned to them. In order to guard against the danger and abuses which might arise from that independence, the power necessary for the exercise of those functions had to be carefully limited and strictly defined. Thus a system of checks and balances was established in our Constitution, which is calculated to render usurpation impossible. It is, indeed, said that the Executive branch of our Government is responsible to the people, but that responsibility consists only in its being liable to impeachment. For the Secretaries of the President do not, like the Ministers of the Crown of England, sit upon the benches of the Legislature, subject to the immediate control of the parliamentary majority. Our Executive, unlike that of every constitutional government, is stable for a term of four years, removable only on the conviction of treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors. But already Jefferson told you that impeachment is a mere scare-crow. So the Executive moves independently within the circle of its own powers. It is, therefore, of vital importance that this circle should be strictly drawn, and those powers of the Legislature which form a necessary supplement to the powers of the Executive be jealously preserved.

If this system of checks and balances is of a general necessity, it is doubly indispensable in all matters relating to the administration of our foreign policy. It is natural and proper that in all diplomatic transactions with foreign governments, our Executive should be intrusted with a certain discretion. But the Cabinet of the President, not being subject to our Legislature in the same manner as the British Ministry is to Parliament, it is essential that in the absence of immediate control, another system of checks should be placed around the Executive power. This was done in the Constitution by making, not, indeed, the diplomatic transactions themselves, but their ends and results, immediately dependent upon the direct action of Congress. Thus, no treaty can be made and consummated without the approval of the Senate by a two-thirds vote. And Congress alone shall have power to declare war. Why was the war-making power not intrusted to the Executive? It is hardly necessary to describe to you the part which wars have played in the history of the world—the blood of millions spilled, not seldom, for paltry causes; the happiness of generations destroyed; the prosperity of countries blighted for centuries; the rights of men trodden under foot; the progress of civilization set back for ages! Is it wonderful that the framers of our Constitution should not have intrusted a single officer with the formidable power of bringing all these calamities upon the Republic?—an officer, too, who, for a certain time, does not stand under the immediate control of the representatives of the people. The war-making power—one most extensive, involving the interests of a nation—is certainly one of the highest attributes of sovereignty, and it was mostly reserved to that branch of the government in which the sovereignty of the people is most comprehensively represented. The power to declare war being withheld from the Executive, and expressly lodged in Congress, it follows that the Executive can have no authority to use warlike measures, unless specially authorized by Congress; for what would the exclusive power to declare war be worth to Congress,

if the power to use belligerent measures without special authority—that is, *to bring on or make war*—were vested in the Executive? This is one of the distinguishing features of our constitutional system. It cannot be changed without breaking down the safeguards of our national security. No man who understands the spirit of American institutions, will fail to see this, and he who does not, may be said not to comprehend the tendency of our fundamental laws. Is it not surprising that we should find such a man in him who is held up to us as "the greatest of living statesmen?" For a number of years, wherever there was a difficulty between this and a foreign government, Mr. Douglas endeavored again and again to invest the President with the power of using warlike measures at his own discretion, without waiting for the action of Congress. Here is a bill introduced by Douglas on the 24th of May, 1858:

"*Be it enacted, &c.*, That in case of flagrant violations of the laws of nations by outrage upon the flag, or soil, or citizens of the United States, or upon their property, under circumstances requiring prompt redress, and when, *in the opinion of the President*, delay would be incompatible with the honor and dignity of the Republic, the President is hereby authorized to employ such force as HE may deem necessary to prevent the perpetration of such outrages, and to obtain just redress and satisfaction for the same when perpetrated; and it shall be his duty to lay the facts of each case, with the reasons for his action in the premises, before Congress at the earliest practicable moment for such further action thereon as Congress may direct."

This bill was introduced at a time when vessels belonging to the British navy, in the Gulf of Mexico, undertook to stop and search American merchantmen on the suspicion of their being slavers. The bill did not pass; but whenever there was an opportunity, be it in a discussion on appropriations for the navy, or on the occasion of some foreign difficulty, he again and again has tried to bring about a fatal transfer of power. It was on the 18th of August, 1859, when he disclosed his views more fully and emphatically than ever before. The President, in a special message, asked for special authority to protect American citizens on the Transit route. Then Mr. Douglas expressed himself as follows:

"I think the President ought to have the power to redress sudden injuries upon our citizens, or outrages upon our flag without waiting for the action of Congress. The Executive of every other nation on earth has that authority, under their respective forms of government. * * * * I go further, Sir. I would entrust the Executive with the authority, when an outrage is perpetrated upon our ships and commerce, to punish it instantly, when he thinks the interest and the honor of the nation require prompt action. I would make this principle general in its application. I desire the President of the United States to have as much authority to protect American citizens and the American flag abroad as the Executive of every other civilized nation on earth possesses. * * * * I was willing to adopt the principle that this authority shall be vested in the President of the United States as a rightful authority and a permanent rule of action, applicable all over the world whenever HE thinks American interests and American honor require it to be exerted. * * * * When it is known that our Executive has the same authority outside of the United States that the *British Premier* and the *French Emperor*, or the head of any other nation possesses, you will find there will be a less number of outrages," &c.

If Mr. Douglas had brought forward propositions like this in the heat of debate, aroused by warlike excitement, we might excuse him on the plea that his temper ran away with his judgment. But the frequent, deliberate, persistent reiteration of his views, must urge the conviction upon us that they have become with him a settled political doctrine. Did he ever consider the extent and consequences of the change he demands? Does he know what it means, that the President shall have the power, without waiting for the action of Congress, to use the army and navy when he—not when Congress, but when *he* thinks the interests of the country require it? Suppose the President be a man of excitable temper—of more valor than discretion—or a man of inordinate ambition—or a wily politician, unscrupulous enough to involve the country in war in order to divert popular attention from home difficulties. Suppose such a President has the power to use the armed forces of the United States when he thinks fit. Will not our peace and security be entirely at the mercy of his temper, his ambition, or his unscrupulousness?

This is not so dangerous, says Mr Douglas, for "not every belligerent act leads to war." No, certainly not; but if there is anything in the world apt to lead to war it is a belligerent act. It is true, according to Mr. Douglas's bill, the President will have to report to Congress "at the "earliest practicable moment;" but will not the President be able, by an indirect use of the army or navy, to involve the country in war, to array nation against nation, long before that "earliest "practicable moment" arrives? It is true Congress will, after a while, have power to stop the war; but are you not aware that ours is a Government which depends not always on a calm public opinion, but sometimes also on the passions of the people? If once, by the measures of the President, we are in active hostilities—if once the intoxicating music of artillery has started the warlike enthusiasm of the people—if once the fighting spirit of the masses is aroused by the sight of blood, will not then what was commenced against the judgment of the people be pushed by their passions?

Mr. Douglas urged his proposition as often as there was a speck of war in the horizon. But those difficulties with Great Britain and the Central American Republics, for the prosecution of which he demanded that the Executive be invested with power to adopt warlike measures, have been settled by diplomatic transactions. Our peaceful relations with foreign Governments were hardly disturbed. Not a drop of blood was shed. The honor of the Republic remains intact, the Constitution inviolate. Suppose Mr. Douglas' notions had prevailed, and he had been President of the United States, clothed with the discretionary power he demanded. I ask you most seriously, and invite you to ponder the question, what would have been the result then? How many outrages, real or imaginary, would he have punished with the army or navy, "without waiting for the action of Congress?" How often would *he*, unrestrained by Congress, have deemed instant redress necessary? Into how many follies would his childish hatred of Great Britain have betrayed him? Into how many wars would his sensation policy have involved us within these last few years? With the blood of your sons you would have paid the price of his indiscretions. Let the President have the power that Mr. Douglas demands for him, and the question of peace or war, of prosperity or desolation, will depend upon the temper of a single individual. Put Mr. Douglas in the Presidential chair, and give him, as he demands, the power of the French Emperor, and he will furnish not the prudence, but certainly the arbitrariness.

But he contends that our Executive must have the power, because *the Executive of every other*

nation has it. Indeed! Does he not know that just there is the difference between our system of Government and those of other countries? Did it never occur to him that the establishment of imperial power in this Republic would require the entire overthrow of our checks and balances? Does he not know that even in the hands of a British Premier, this power is less formidable than it would be in the hands of a President, since the British Premier is subject to the immediate control of a parliamentary majority, and liable to be voted down and dismissed at any moment, which the President and his Secretary of State are not? Oh, "greatest of living statesmen!" if thou dost not know that, every sweet little school-boy can tell thee. But there you see him, "in the fullness of his ignorance of this "vast subject, in the maturity of his incapacity "to apprehend its merits," as Lord Brougham would style it, attempting to trample down the constitutional safeguards which surround the liberties, and the security of the nation. Such ignorance is dangerous when coupled with such pretensions. Let that "greatest of living statesmen" study awhile the peculiar features which distinguish the republican government of America from the monarchical governments of the old world. Give him an opportunity to learn that an American President or Secretary of State was never intended to be a British Premier or a French Emperor. Let him learn to appreciate that system of nice balances of power in our Constitution, which is the principal safeguard of our freedom and security. But don't speak of placing him, such as he is, in the office of highest responsibility. If you want a *safe* man to administer your laws, select him among those who understand their spirit, not one who means to cushion his Presidential chair with imperial powers, and who would take delight in playing like a reckless boy with the club of Hercules.

It is my suspicion that Mr. Douglas tried to effect that centralization of power in the hands of the President, expecting to be President himself, and that then he would use it for the purpose of plunging the country into warlike enterprises, to result in the conquering of Cuba and a part of Mexico, which policy of conquest would relieve him of the difficulties in which his position upon the Slavery question has involved him. I give this as my suspicion. You may judge for yourselves whether it is supported by any material evidence growing out of his past career and present situation. But the measure he urged and advocated is so dangerous and detestable in itself, that no ulterior design can make it more damnable. It certainly is one of the acts dictated by the evident desire to retrieve the lost favor of the Slavery propagandists by outdoing them in everything not immediately connected with the Territorial question. This may be considered a grave charge, and I will substantiate it at once, for in these times Judge Douglas's statesmanship shines with more than ordinary lustre.

John Brown had made his insurrectionary attempt in Virginia. The Republicans openly disapproved of the act, and denounced him in good faith, as they would disapprove and denounce every interference with the laws and institutions of other States, as a violation of the spirit of our institutions, which furnish for every evil a lawful remedy. But the South was excited, and Douglas saw a chance for himself. He pounced upon it with almost indecent eagerness, morbidly anxious to anticipate the action of the Committee on the Harper's Ferry affair, which was expected to offer propositions applicable to the case. On the 22d of January, 1860, he introduced the following resolution into the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to report a bill for the protection of each State and Territory in the Union against invasion by the authorities, or inhabitants of any other State or Territory, and for the suppression and punishment of conspiracies or combinations in any State or Territory with intent to invade, assail or molest the government, property or institutions of any other State or Territory of the Union.

The true intent and meaning of this resolution, was made plain by the speech with which the Judge accompanied it. After having endeavored to show that the Constitution confers upon our Federal Government the power to do what the resolution contemplates, he then defines his object as follows:

"Sir, I hold that it is not only necessary to use the military power when the actual case of invasion shall occur, but to authorize the judicial department of the Government to suppress all conspiracies and combinations in the several States with intent to invade a State, or molest or disturb its government, its peace, its citizens, its property, or its institutions. *You must suppress the conspiracy, the combination to do the act, and then you will suppress it in advance.* * * I demand that the Constitution be executed in good faith, so as to punish and suppress every combination, either to invade a State, or to molest its inhabitants, or to disturb its property, or to subvert its institutions and its government. I believe this can be effectually done by authorizing the United States Courts in the several States to take jurisdiction of the offense, and punish the violation of the law with appropriate punishments."

So much about the way in which the combinations can be and ought to be suppressed and punished. Now what are and where are the combinations?

"Sir," said the Judge, "what were the causes which produced the Harper's Ferry outrage? Without stopping to adduce the evidence in detail, I have no hesitancy in expressing my firm and deliberate conviction that the Harper's Ferry crime was the natural, logical and inevitable result of the doctrines and teachings of the Republican party, as explained and enforced in their platform, their partisan presses, their pamphlets and books, and especially in the speeches of their leaders in and out of Congress. * * * The great principle that underlies the Republican party, is violent, irreconcilable, eternal warfare upon the institutions of American Slavery, with a view to its ultimate extinction throughout the land."

This language is plain. There is the dangerous combination *with intent* to carry on a violent warfare against the institutions of other States. Now, let us see what the Judge is going to do with the unfortunate combination to which, I am sorry to say, most of us belong.

"Sir," says the Judge, "give us such a law as the Constitution contemplates and authorizes and I will show the Senator from New York that there is a constitutional mode of repressing the irrepressible conflict. I will open the prison-door, and allow the conspirators against the peace of the Republic and the domestic tranquillity of other States to select their cells, wherein to drag out a miserable life as a punishment for their crimes against the peace of society."

But in order to remove all doubt as to what the conspiracy and combination is, he proceeds:

"Can any man say to us that, although this outrage has been perpetrated at Harper's Ferry, there is no danger of its recurrence? Sir, is not the Republican party still embodied organized, confident of success and defiant in its pretensions? Does it not now hold and proclaim the same creed as before the invasion? Those doctrines remain the same. Those teachings are being poured into the minds of men throughout the country by means of speeches, and pamphlets and books, and through partisan presses. The causes that produced the Harper's Ferry invasion are now in active operation. * * Mr. President, the mode of preserving peace is plain. This system of sectional warfare

must cease. The Constitution has given the power; and all we ask of Congress is to give the means, and we, by indictments and convictions in the Federal Courts of the several States, will make such examples of the leaders of such conspiracies as will strike terror into the hearts of others; and there will be an end of this crusade. Sir we must check it by crushing out the conspiracy and combination; and then there can be safety."

I confess, when I read that speech, and the resolution in defense of which it was made, I stood horror-struck—not as though I had feared that a Congress *could be found* so degenerate as to pass such a law, but because a Senator *had been found* who had the effrontery to advocate it in the open halls of an American Legislature. This is not a mere figure of speech. I do not exaggerate. Only look at it. A treasonable attempt has been committed. The offenders are punished. Mr. Douglas introduces a proposition for a law intended to prevent a repetition of the attempt. He pretends to discover the origin of the treasonable attempt in the opinions and doctrines of a great national party. He charges that party with urging a sectional warfare and crusade against the institutions of some of the States, and declares that this crusade is carried on by speeches, pamphlets, books, and partisan presses—by ideas being poured into the minds of the people. He declares that there can be no peace as long as those causes which produced the treasonable attempt remain in active operation. He proposes to check this crusade by crushing out the conspiracies and combinations by which it is carried on; and the means by which he intends to crush them out are indictments and convictions in the Federal Courts, making such examples of the leaders as will strike terror into the hearts of others. He proposes to open prison cells for them, wherein to drag out a miserable life. This is the proposition submitted to the Senate of the American Republic—not by the King of Naples, not by the Vizier of the Turkish Sultan, not by the Chief of Police of the Russian Czar, not by one of the Terrorists of the French Revolution—but by an American Senator, on the 23d of July, 1860. I will not stoop to defend the Republican party against these accusations. They are of so ridiculous, so preposterous a nature, as not to call for the serious notice of any candid man. But no matter. Let us embody the intent and meaning of Mr. Douglas's resolution and speech in the shape of a law. It will probably read as follows:

"SECTION 1. *Be it enacted, &c.*, That if any person or persons, residing in any State or Territory, shall unlawfully combine or conspire together, with intent to invade, assail or molest the Government, inhabitants, property, or institutions, of any other State or Territory, or if any person or persons, with intent, as aforesaid, shall counsel, advise, or attempt to procure any riot, invasion, unlawful assembly, or combination, whether such conspiracy, threatening, counsel, advice, or attempt, shall have the proposed effect or not, he or they shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and upon conviction before any Court of the United States, having jurisdiction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding —— dollars, or by imprisonment during a term not less than —— years, nor exceeding —— years; and further, at the discretion of the Court, may be holden to find security for his good behavior, in such sum, and for such time, as the Court may direct."

This section would cover the conspiracies and combinations themselves. But Douglas says that such treasonable things will be repeated as long as the causes from which they spring remain in active operation. He, therefore, wants to crush out the causes; which may be done by section second:

"SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That if any person, inhabitant of any one State or Territory, shall write, print, utter, or publish or shall cause or procure to be written, printed, or uttered, or published, or shall knowingly or willingly authorize or aid in writing, printing, uttering, or publishing any scandalous or malicious writing or writings against the Government, inhabitants, laws, or institutions of other States or Territories, with intent to defame the said Government, inhabitants, laws, or institutions, or to excite against them the hatred of the good people of any of the States, or to excite any unlawful combinations for invading, assailing, or molesting the Government, inhabitants, property, or institutions, of other States or Territories, being thereof convicted before any Court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof, he shall be punished by a fine not exceeding —— dollars, and by imprisonment not exceeding —— years."

Every candid person will at once admit that these two sections, as I have drawn them, contain nothing—not a single point, not a single expression, that is not expressly and directly suggested by Mr. Douglas's resolution and speech. It so happens that a law like this is not without precedent in the history of this Republic. It is not quite unknown to our own statute book, for the two sections I laid before you are embodied with scrupulous accuracy. Mr. Douglas's propositions *are the literal copy of the notorious Sedition Law of* 1798. I only put in "Governments, inhabitants, property, or institutions of other States "and Territories," instead of "Government of "the United States or either House of Congress." The rest is exactly alike; no, let me not slander the Sedition Law. The terms of imprisonment prescribed by the Sedition Law are moderate, not exceeding two and five years respectively, while Mr. Douglas insists upon his victims "dragging out in their prison cells their miserable lives," of which ten years would evidently not be sufficient. Then this Sedition Law was enacted only for a very limited period, after which it was to expire, while Mr. Douglas intends the Conspiracy Act to be a permanent institution of the country. These two features make the Sedition Law eminently liberal in comparison with Douglas's Conspiracy Bill.

There may be some old man among us who remembers the time when the Sedition law was enacted—he will tell you that the same act which was intended to prevent insurrection, led people upon the very brink of an insurrection; he will tell you that patriots, horrified at that time for the liberties of the people, thought of the necessity of a second revolution. The excitement of those days has left its monument in the history of this country—that monument is the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, drawn by Jefferson and Madison. These resolutions were the loud outcry of patriotic hearts against the first flagrant attempt at the centralization of Governmental power. The Democratic party has indorsed them again. It claims Jefferson as its father. What would Jefferson, the author of the Kentucky resolutions, say of his degenerate offspring who have nominated a man for the Presidency who attempts to repeat the most tyrannical and outrageous act of the Federalists in the same outrageous form? Would he not tell them that they must be mistaken in their ancestry?

Let me show the consequence of the measure, and you will understand why its forerunner created such serious alarm and apprehension. So far our political parties have been fighting with arguments. The victors obtained possession of the constitutional power, and administered the Government, but had no power to violate the rights and liberties of those that were defeated. However the contest of parties may have ended,

the peace of the country was never materially disturbed, for the vanquished knew that their individual security was not impaired. Such was the uniform result of the fight with arguments. But let the political parties once begin to fight with indictments—put into their hands the two-edged weapon of persecution, and whatever delusion you may indulge in, the liberties of the people will be no more secure in America than they are in Austria and Naples.

There is one kind of despotism more terrible than that of kings—that is the despotism of political parties. Their tendency is not only to defeat but to oppress their opponents. However pure their first intentions may be, they will, in the heat of political contest, insensibly drift into that irresistible current. There is but one way to prevent this: it is that the means of oppression and persecution be carefully kept out of their reach by strictly limiting and circumscribing the powers of the Government. Do not say that these dangerous tendencies may be averted by a change of parties. It is oppression that engenders an oppressive spirit; upon persecution follows revolution and revenge—that is, new persecution, and so on. You may know where it began, but not where it will end. The framers of our Constitution understood that well; they defined the crimes of which the Federal Courts shall have jurisdiction with scrupulous nicety. They laid down the doctrine that treason against the Government shall consist in levying war against the United States, not in giving aid and comfort to their enemies, and nothing else; and that no person shall be convicted of treason unless upon the testimony of two witnesses, not to the "combination with treasonable intent," but to the *overt act*, thus carefully guarding against the idea of constructive treason. They knew well that the usual rules of legal construction in regard to common crimes should not be applied to political matters in which conscience and the freedom of opinion is involved, because justice in one might become oppression and tyranny in the other case. But even these constitutional safeguards appeared so insufficient to the people of those days, that in the amendments to the Constitution they surrounded the fundamental rights and liberties of the citizen with a new bulwark of emphatic declaration. Hence this fierce, indignant uncompromising opposition to every measure tending to give latitude to the power of the Government over individual rights.

Judge Douglas seems to have no conception of the groundwork upon which the safety of popular liberty rests. Let him not pretend to say that he intended the law for the prevention of political offenses, for he ought to know, as every well-informed man knows, that of all the laws in the world which fasten the chains of despotism upon mankind, there is hardly one which does not rest upon the pretext that political offenses must be prevented. Prevention of mischief was the snare with which people in all ages and all countries have been prevented from asserting their liberties. Preventive laws are the poison with which freedom is killed. It is said that, years ago, an American citizen met Prince Metternich in the city of Brussels. You remember who Prince Metternich was. The history of the world hardly knows the minister who had to answer for more tears and curses of crushed nations. The American showed him the Constitution of the United States, and asked his opinion of it. "This Constitution," said the Prince, "and I can govern the Empire of Austria with it." "What is that?" asked the American with astonishment. "It is the power of the central government to pass preventive laws." What a pity Prince Metternich is dead. In Judge Douglas he would have found the man of his heart. Put the Judge's Conspiracy Bill upon our statute book, and declare it Constitutional, and the deficiency is supplied. Prince Metternich is willing to govern Austria, after his fashion, with the Constitution of the United States. Place the power to indict and punish for combinations and for criminal intent in political matters into the hands of our Federal Judges, those petty proconsuls who feel big when they can show their power, and we shall soon have a little Star Chamber in every little judicial district, a little Fouquier Tinville to act as prosecuting attorney, and a little Jeffries to pass the sentences of the court, there will be a government spy to smell out treasonable combinations wherever three or four of them are assembled, and the cells of your prisons filled with men who have the spirit to think and speak about Slavery as Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Franklin thought and spoke.

And there are those who dare to call the man who proposed to inaugurate such a system of policy, a "great statesman." To the honor of Southern men be it said in both cases, when he proposed to confer the war-making power upon the President, as when he introduced the New Sedition Law, he had the mortification of being put down by a slaveholder. It was in both cases Jefferson Davis, the leader of the Fire-eaters, who had the patriotic spirit to vindicate our Republican institutions against the disgusting schemes of Northern demagogues.

But a Northern man also was listening with indignant astonishment to Douglas's speech in favor of the New Sedition Law; that was the brave John Hickman, of Pennsylvania, the Anti-Lecompton Democrat, who believed what he said. And when he left the Senate Chamber he broke out in the words: "On thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life."

And well might he say so, for the proposition whispered into the ears of the fairest of our kind by the serpent of Paradise was hardly more infamous and infernal than the proposition Douglas whispered in the ears of the present generation.

Where did Mr. Douglas learn these doctrines? He has been in Europe. Unable to comprehend the means by which liberty is to be preserved in this country, he seems to have studied the means by which people are enslaved there. Not in England, but in France and Russia, he found much to admire. (I don't know whether he visited Austria and Naples.) He basked in the sunshine of the smiles of the Czar, Nicholas. The smiles of a despot sank deeply into his heart, and this conspiracy bill grew out of it.

And this is your "greatest of living statesmen." If this is the ruling statesmanship of our days, then good night, dearly-bought liberties! good night, bright American Republic! good night, great beacon of struggling humanity! If it is statesmanship to subvert the principles of the Constitution, undermine the liberties of the people, to place the security of the individual at the mercy of the centralized Government, then, indeed, he is one of the greatest, and his statue

deserves to be erected side by side with that of the illustrious Cataline of Rome, and the patriotic Strafford of England. I do not fear that the man who made the infamous attempt will be elevated to the highest trust in this Republic, for a just fate has already irrevocably decreed against him; but I do fear that there may be thousands of men who will not have spirit enough to stigmatize him with their repudiation. I appeal to you, American freemen. Your hearts cannot harbor the sincere feeling of gratitude for the heroes and sages who gave liberty to this land, if you do not harbor a curse for the man who attempts to destroy it with his insidious schemes.

Let me proceed: It would seem that the policy of a man who introduces and advocates such measures, must spring either from the profoundest ignorance of the principles upon which the liberty of men is maintained, or an innate love of the principles by which the liberty of men is subverted. It will, therefore, surprise you a little when I tell you that Douglas's system of policy rests upon the basis of a profound philosophical doctrine concerning the only safe foundation upon which human liberty rests. It has always struck me as very remarkable, and it may have occurred to a great many of you, that Mr. Douglas's mind, with all its acuteness and fertility and resources, is exceedingly barren in original conception. All the speeches he has delivered since 1854 carry the peculiar flavor of staleness about them. They contain nothing but some stereotyped and somewhat commonplace ideas, played in a sonorous, mellow swell of language which derives its principal charm from the animal vigor and energy with which it is puffed out.

And here permit me to say, by the way, that in my humble judgment I consider him one of the most over-estimated men in the country. But his speeches do contain one original idea, and I tell you that is a bright one; it belongs all to him; nobody ever advocated it before, and nobody will hereafter. We have been laboring under the impression that Douglas did not care whether Slavery be voted up or down; but we must beg his pardon—it turns out that he does care; for the only original idea he can boast of is that Slavery must necessarily exist for the sake of—*variety*. [Laughter.] Don't laugh, I pray you—it is a very serious matter—it is the fundamental principle upon which Mr. Douglas's whole statesmanship rests; and as he is the greatest statesman alive, it certainly deserves a serious consideration. He tells us that it is the very issue upon which he conducted the canvass in Illinois in 1858—it is the very ground upon which he placed the necessity of his Conspiracy bill, and he has peddled it all over the Union in numberless speeches.

The original idea, as expressed in his own language, is simply this: "I assert," said he, in his speech opening the canvass of 1858, "that "the great fundamental system which un- "derlies our complex system of State and Fede- "ral Governments, which implies diversity and "dissimilarity in local institutions and domestic "affairs of each and every State then in the Un- "ion, or thereafter to be admitted. I therefore "conceive that Mr. Lincoln has totally misappre- "hended the great principles upon which our "Government rests. Uniformity in local and "domestic affairs would be destructive of States' "rights, of States' sovereignty—of personal lib- "erty and personal freedom. *Wherever the doc- "trine of uniformity is proclaimed; that all the "States must be free or slave; that all the labor "must be white or black;* that all the citizens of "the different States must have the same privi- "leges, or must be ruled by the same regulations; "*you have destroyed the greatest safeguards "which our institutions have thrown around the "rights of the citizen.* From this view of the "case I am driven irresistibly to the conclusion "that diversity, dissimilarity, *variety* in all our "local and domestic institutions is the great safe- "guard of our liberties. * * I repeat, that "uniformity in our institutions is neither possi- "ble nor desirable."

This may sound very profound, but it will not require many words to show you how exceedingly ridiculous it is. Whatever your opinions of the Judge's statesmanship may be, permit me to say that whenever he attempts to act the philosopher, he becomes—not to put too fine a point upon it—very funny.

His argument is, that there is a variety of interests or domestic affairs in the country; that a variety of local institutions grows out of them; that upon this variety of institutions our federal system of Government rests; that the federal system of Government is the great safeguard of our liberties; that consequently in order to preserve our liberties it is necessary to preserve a variety of domestic affairs and local institutions. The question arises, if that variety of domestic affairs and local institutions did not exist, would that render the federal system of government impossible? In other words, would a people, among whom there is no such variety of domestic affairs and local institutions, be incapable of freedom?

The original States entered into a union as separate organizations — whether distinct and separate on the ground of a variety of interests, or for any other reason, is needless to discuss, for if their institutions and interests had been ever so uniform, it is evident that they could and would not have consolidated. But a conclusive refutation of the Judge's theory lies nearer. The people of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin, are nearly all depending upon the same resources—these States are all essentially agricultural, and, besides, have some shipping interest upon the great lakes. Their domestic affairs and local institutions are essentially the same. Their system of labor is the same—neither of them holds slaves. The uniformity of Free Labor was introduced there by the Ordinance in '87. According to the Judge's theory, they must consolidate if there is among them no variety of domestic affairs and local institutions which keep them asunder. It might be said that they cannot consolidate now on account of constitutional obstacles. Granted, for argument's sake. But that vast extent of land was consolidated once in one great solid mass, called the North-Western Territory. Why did it not remain consolidated? Why was it cut up into different Territories and States, since their domestic interests were the same, their local institutions the same, their system of labor the same? There was complete uniformity, and yet the very opposite of consolidation. All these things remain essentially the same. And do they desire to consolidate? And is it necessary to make half of them Slave States in order to keep them asunder? It is prepos-

terous. But this example shows that not Mr. Lincoln but Judge Douglas must have entirely misconceived the source from which our political institutions spring.

That source is nothing else but the instinct of self-government animating our people. Why do we cut up our States into counties and townships—even its States in which the interests and domestic affairs of the people are everywhere quite uniform? For the simple reason that the instinct of self-government demands that all the functions of sovereignty which the people can exercise by direct action should remain in the hands of the people; and that all political power which cannot be exercised by that direct action should be so organized as to remain as near the original source of sovereignty as possible. This renders necessary such divisions and local organizations as will place the direct administration of the nearest home affairs immediately into the hands of the people. The affairs a little more remote in general are intrusted to the State Governments, subject to the immediate control of the people; while the affairs of interests still more remote in general are put into the hands of the Federal Government. This ramification, division, and subdivision of political power is carried out no less where there is a uniformity of domestic affairs and local institutions, than where there exists variety. It will remain such just as long as the people insist upon administering these affairs by as direct an exercise of sovereignty as possible, and no longer. To pretend that this ramification of political power into a complex gradation of functions cannot exist without there being a variety of interests and domestic institutions, would be to say that the people among whom there is no such variety cannot be free; and that is a nonsense which the merest schoolboy would be ashamed of.

But suppose, for argument sake, a variety of interests were really so great and indispensable a prop and pillar of our institutions of self-government—is Judge Douglas unacquainted with the difference between manufacturing Massachusetts and Connecticut and commercial New York—between mining Pennsylvania and agricultural Illinois? But that variety does not seem to be sufficient for the Judge—there is still too much uniformity in it. He insists that "where the "doctrine of uniformity is proclaimed all the "States must be free or slave—that all labor "must be white or black." Our liberties must necessarily go by the board, therefore we must have more variety. The variety of manufacturing and commercial, mining and agricultural products, is sadly insufficient. He insists that there must be a little variety of Freedom and Slavery, of white and black labor; and that seems to be his favorite mixture; his cardinal fundamental, *sine qua non* variety; and not only have we no right to establish uniform Free Labor by encroaching upon the rights of the States, but quite as a general thing, the extinction of his favorite *variety*, "would be neither possible nor "desirable." He declares it to be "a fatal heresy "to proclaim that there can or ought to be uni-"formity among the different States of this "Union." It would, then, according to the Judge, not be desirable that Free Labor should prevail everywhere, for that would create uniformity, and uniformity is the death of Freedom.

And now mark that wonderful muddle of nonsense in the head of that "greatest of living "statesmen"—our liberties rest upon our Federal system of Government; our Federal system of Government rests upon the variety of institutions; that variety of institutions consists of there being Slavery in some of the States. If Slavery disappeared, that variety would disappear; if that variety disappeared, our Federal system of Government would disappear; if our Federal system of Government disappeared, the safeguards of our liberties would be destroyed—consequently, if Slavery disappears liberty disappears also.

Again, if all the States were free there would be uniformity; but uniformity in local and domestic affairs would be destructive of personal liberty—that uniformity is prevented by the existence of Slavery, consequently the existence of Slavery prevents the destruction of liberty; or liberty cannot be preserved but by the preservation of Slavery.

What benefactors of our humanity were those who introduced Slavery into our land? for they furnished the material out of which the necessary variety was made, without which our liberty cannot exist. If they had not done so, then all the States would be free; there would be uniformity, and we would all be slaves! What nonsense to abolish the slave trade! The more slaves, the more variety—the more variety, the more freedom.

How we must pity the unfortunate nations that have no Slavery among them; for they have no variety of institutions, and having no variety of institutions, they can have no liberty. Poor people that have no slaves among them; they can never be free!

It is a little surprising, however, that this great and luminous doctrine of "*variety*" should have been so little known about the time when our Government was organized and the Constitution framed. There were two individuals living then who enjoyed some little reputation for statesmanship, one of whom said: "I trust we shall have a Confederacy of Free States;" and the other said: "Nothing is more certainly written in the Book of Fate than that those people [meaning the slaves] are to be free." And they were called statesmen! What an immense progress we have made in these seventy years! They would be called simpletons or traitors now; for they either knew nothing of the great doctrine of "*variety*"—which was very foolish—or, if they knew it, they plotted the destruction of popular freedom by advocating uniformity—which certainly was very treasonable. By the way, the name of one was George Washington, and the name of the other, Thomas Jefferson. You will be obliged to confess that you were very much mistaken in those two men. What a pity Judge Douglas did not live in those days. How he would have knocked his great doctrine of *variety* about their ears! How he would have taught Washington what the definition of our Federal system is! How he would have told Jefferson what the great safeguards of liberty are!

But, alas! such statesmen are sometimes born not only out of season, but also out of place. What a pity Judge Douglas does not live in Switzerland, the oldest Republic now extant. Those benighted people, the Swiss, have been for centuries indulging in the foolish delusion that they were free, and that they had a federal system of Government. Why there is no Slavery in Switz-

erland—there is not the necessary variety of institutions there. Their States are all Free States. There is uniformity there. How can they have federal institutions with uniformity? How can there be liberty without variety? Impossible. Poor, innocent souls! they think they are free, and have no slaves. Let the Judge go at once on a missionary expedition to liberate the Swiss. He will have an opportunity to try that other great original idea of his, that "any political "creed must be radically wrong which cannot be "proclaimed everywhere." I venture to predict that every honest Swiss boot will lift itself and kick the great variety Douglas respectfully from Alp to Alp.

Now look at the strange consequences into which his variety doctrine inevitably leads him. The necessity of preserving Slavery for the sake of Liberty—that is, of preserving the variety of institutions—was the principal ground upon which he placed the necessity of passing his Conspiracy bill. The same man who tells us that Slavery must be preserved because its extinction would bring about uniformity, which, in its turn, would produce a consolidated despotic Government—the same man advocates the passage of a measure investing the Government with powers which put it upon the courses of consolidation; for, without the grant of these powers, without that act of consolidation, Slavery cannot be maintained. Slavery, according to him, must be preserved by a measure which is necessary to popular liberty; for, if Slavery is not preserved, uniformity will ensue, and the liberties of the people will be in danger. In other words, he tells us that the existence of Slavery is necessary for the preservation of our rights and liberties, and then he tells us that a measure undermining our rights and liberties is necessary for the preservation of Slavery. The variety must be kept up for the purpose of maintaining our liberties, and our liberties must be put down for the purpose of keeping the variety.

We are, indeed, greatly indebted to Judge Douglas. At last we know what Slavery is good for, and why its extinction is neither possible nor desirable. Even the black man, in his sufferings, will find a soothing consolation in the Judge's philosophy. When Sambo is flogged down South, and the whip lacerates his back, the benevolent Judge will tell the poor fellow that he has got to be whipped for the sake of variety [laughter]; and Sambo will smile in the sweet consciousness of being whipped for a very great principle. [Renewed laughter.] And when the Judge's bill has passed, he has opened for you the prison cells wherein he blandly invites you "to drag out your miserable lives," you will with pride remember the old Roman proverb, "*Dulce et decorum est "patria mori;*" and improving upon the text you will exclaim, "It is most sweet and honor-"able to die for variety's sake."

This, then, is Judge Douglas's philosophy of government; not an idea occasionally dropped in a speech, but his great original conception. This shallow, ridiculous, childish nonsense, is what he emphatically proclaims to be the fundamental doctrine of his whole political wisdom! Oh, Douglas Democrats, how proud you must feel of your "greatest statesman alive." Permit me to offer you, in the name of the Republican party, our sincerest congratulations.

Gentlemen: You have accompanied my remarks with some evidence of merriment; and, indeed, it cannot be denied that there is some of the profundity of the illustrious Dogberry in Mr. Douglas's philosophical doctrines. But this is a serious matter. Do you not see that to some extent the honor of the country is involved in it? That gentleman stands before us a candidate for the Presidency, and he is represented to be the "greatest American statesman." And now, I entreat you, I implore you solemnly—for there is no man here who has the reputation of this country more deeply at heart than I have—I implore you, do not make this Republic ridiculous in the eyes of the whole world by attempting to crown that Dogberry statesman with the highest honors of the Republic. I am not jesting; I am in deep and solemn earnest; for if you look over the list of those men who, since the organization of the Republic, have been deemed worthy of a vote for the Presidency, you will find not one among them who has laid more insiduous schemes to subvert the principles of the Constitution, who did more to debauch the consciences of the people, more to bring American statesmanship into contempt than he. No, I will not wrong Judge Douglas; there was one; I mean Aaron Burr. He was a more dangerous man, for he united to a depraved heart a far superior understanding.

But, as to Judge Douglas, here I stand up before the great jury of the sovereign people and bring my bill of indictment.

I arraign him for having changed his position in regard to the Missouri restriction, time and again, according to the interests of Slavery.

I arraign him for having broken the plighted faith of the people by the repeal of the Compromise of 1820.

I arraign him for having upheld the most atrocious violations of the ballot-box; for having trampled upon the most sacred rights of the people of Kansas, so long as the struggle between Freedom and Slavery was doubtful.

I arraign him for having committed a fraud upon the people by forging and adulterating the principle of Popular Sovereignty, and making it the machine of Slavery propagandism.

I arraign him for having deserted the cause of Free Kansas when the people, having complied with all reasonable conditions, applied for admission into the Union.

I arraign him for having repeatedly made the attempt to disturb the system of constitutional checks and balances, by placing the war-making power in the hands of the President.

I arraign him for having attempted, by his conspiracies, a thing more outrageous than the Sedition Law of 1798, to put the liberties of speech and press at the mercy of a political inquisition, and to make the judicial persecution of opinions a standard system of policy.

I arraign him, lastly, for having attempted to pass off upon the people the doctrines of political philosophy, which is an insult to the popular understanding. No, I beg your pardon, I do not arraign him for that, for this is a free country, where everybody has a right to make himself as ridiculous as he pleases, "subject only to the Constitution of the United States." [Loud laughter.] And, yet, I arraign him for that also, for I protest that he has no right to make the Republic ridiculous with him.

Here is the charge. It is for the people to give the verdict.

Gentlemen, will you have patience enough to

listen to a few remarks about Douglas, "the Presidential candidate?" Well, after these exploits he thought he was fit to be a Democratic candidate for the Presidency, and so his name went before the Charleston Convention. But, wonderful to tell, the whole Southern Democracy seemed to be united against him; and I honestly declare I think the Slave Power did wrong. It might have found a more abject and less exacting tool, but it could hardly expect to find a more daring, reckless and unscrupulous one. What was the reason of their opposition? Was it the Constitutional quibbles about which they had been contending? The whole difference was merely imaginary. Was it the slaveholders thought a man who had betrayed his own section of the country could not be relied upon in his promises to be faithful to another? That was more honorable than judicious in the Slave Power, governed by such a feeling. No, I think the true reason widely differs from this, and it shows that Mr. Douglas never had the sagacity enough to understand his own position. The Slave Power will sometimes, for expediency's sake, condescend to make a Northern man President, if he consents to be its unconditional tool, but it will never elevate one who aspires to be or become a leader of the party. Mr. Douglas ought to have understood that. There was his mistake. However willing he may have been to serve them, he had to serve them not in his, but in their own way. He affected independence, and he fell. I think the South acted against their own interest, for in Judge Douglas they would have had a man in the Presidential chair who would have shrunk from nothing to regain their favor. It is my conviction that he would have been a more ultra Pro-slavery President than Breckinridge, or Jefferson Davis, or Slidell, and I wish they would still conclude to take him, so as to place every man in his proper position. You see we are not afraid of your combinations.

But the mistake was committed. They opposed him to the last, and Judge Douglas saw that his nomination in Charleston was an impossibility. Then his friends moved an adjournment of the Convention, and carried it. They were to re-assemble at Baltimore a few weeks afterward. In the meantime, Mr. Douglas saw a last chance of appeasing the South. He grasped at it with desperate eagerness, and he saw the great prize slipping from his hands, and he staked his all upon a last cast. On the 15th and 16th of May, he arose in the Senate, and in one of the most elaborate efforts of his life, he made the following statement, and Douglas Democrats I claim your special attention. Listen:

"It is part of the history of that country that under this doctrine of non-intervention—this doctrine that you delight to call Squatter Sovereignty—the people of New Mexico have introduced and protected Slavery in the whole of that Territory, under the doctrine they have converted a tract of Free Territory into Slave Territory more than five times the size of the State of New York. Under this doctrine Slavery has been extended not only up to 36° 30′, but up to 38°, giving you a degree and a half more of slave Territory than you ever claimed. * * * Whatever inch of Free Territory has been converted into Slave Territory on the American continent since the Revolution, except in New Mexico and Virginia, under the principle of non-intervention affirmed at Charleston? If it be true that this principle of non-intervention has protected Slavery in that comparatively Northern and cold region, where you did not expect it to go, cannot you trust the same principle further South, when you come to acquire additional Territory from Mexico? Will not the same principle protect in the Northern States of Mexico when they are acquired, since they are now surrounded by Slave Territory?"

Oh, Douglas men, what a lesson is this! Did you not tell us that when the Nebraska bill was enacted, that this law was the most efficient way of introducing Free Labor into the Territories? Have you not most solemnly assured us every day since 1854 that the principle of Popular Sovereignty as expounded by Mr. Douglas would most certainly save all the Territories from the grasp of Slavery? And now look there! Your own master and prophet admits, *acknowledges*, and BOASTS of it—that this same principle gave to Slavery one and one-half degrees of latitude more than it ever claimed, and that since the organization of the American Republic not a square foot of Free Territory was ever converted into Slave Territory, but by the same measure which you represented to us as the greatest and most reliable engine of Free Labor! Your own master and prophet tells you in your own faces, and in the face of all mankind, and in the face of posterity, that you have been lying most atrociously—lying every day for the last six years. This was unkind—was it not, Douglasites of the North?

No; I am not joking. It was terribly unkind. All he said was most certainly, most undoubtedly, most uncontrovertibly true; but I declare that if he had the least regard for the feelings of his friends—the least sympathy for them in their awkward embarrassments—he, *he* ought to have been the last on earth to make that statement. Did he know that you had supported him and made friends for him on the false pretence that his great principle worked the exclusion of Slavery from the Territories? Did he not know that you had pledged your honor—had staked your character for truth and veracity upon that pretence? He knew it well. He had encouraged you in doing so; and, after you have compromised yourself for him, day after day, in the eyes of the whole world, *he* turns and gives you most unceremoniously the lie. Oh, that was ungenerous! It was mean—very mean—unspeakably mean. If your self-sacrificing friendship had awakened the least echo in his heart, he ought to have been the last man to do so. But that heart seems to be so filled with calloused selfishness—so destitute of the generous impulses of human nature—that if his friends, like Broderick, die for him, he coldly disowns him; and if they lie for him, he promptly puts them to shame. Disowns them and puts them to shame. And for what? For the purpose of retrieving the lost favors of the South; regaining the lost smiles of the Slave Power, to be sacrificed to them. Was that the reward you had deserved at his hands?

Look at it again. See, he stands before the slaveholders in the Senate of the United States busy bargaining away your honor for their favors. "Who has ever served you more faithfully than "I with my great principle?" he asks them. "Why not let my friends in the North preach up "that principle as the Pioneer of Freedom? The "fools, perhaps, believing in what they say, but "we know better. Do you not see the result?

"Why not permit me the innocent joke of bam-
"boozling the people of the North into believing
"that I am the great Champion of Freedom?"
Ah, Douglas men, what a sight is this! He has prostituted you, and now proclaims your disgrace. How do you like the attitude in which he has placed you? How do you like the pillory to which, with his own hand, he has nailed your ears? And you are willing to stand there—stand there quietly in the eyes of mankind. Do you not sometimes hear an earnest voice speaking within you, speaking of a self-respect and the natural dignity of man? Does it never tell you that the fairest blush of shame would be an ornament to your cheeks? My friends, I love to esteem all that bears the attributes of human nature; but if sometimes, at an unguarded moment, a cloud of contempt arises in my soul, it is at the aspect of this gratuitous self-degradation, for which even ignorance and error can hardly serve as an excuse.

See there your master and prophet, prostrating himself before the Slave Power—in the dust, before your proud opponents! You can no longer say you stand by him, for since that day he does not stand up himself. If you are with him still there, at the foot of the Slave Power, where he lies, you lie with him. And what did the Slaveholders do after he had so meanly humiliated himself, and prostrated his friends? Did they smile upon him? Aye, they did, with scorn, and said, "We loved thy treason well enough, "but we spurn with contempt the traitor;" and there he lies still.

The time of the Baltimore Convention arrived, and the struggle recommenced. It became at once manifest that Douglas's nomination could not be forced upon the Democratic party without splitting that organization in twain; and he saw clearly enough that then his election would be an impossibility. The South was seceding *en masse*, and leaving the rump Convention to do as it pleased. Then Mr. Douglas, seeing a disgraceful defeat inevitable, wrote a letter to his friends in the Convention, requesting them to withdraw his name if they found it in any way consistent to do so. And I declare, if Douglas was ever honest in anything he did or said, I believe he was honest then and there.

But now the moment had arrived when it became manifest that there is justice in history. Douglas's position was disgusting, but his punishment was sublime. Then his friends, for the first time, refused to obey his command. Those whom he had used so often and so long for his own advancement saw now there was a last chance of using him for theirs. They said to him "We have performed our part of the contract; "now you have to perform yours. We have nom-"inated you for the Presidency; now you have "to permit us to be elected Congressmen, Sher-"iffs, County Clerks, or Constables, on the "strength of your name. There is no backing "out. Ho! for the spoils!"

"Dost thou think because thou hast suddenly become virtuous,
There shall be no more cakes and ale?
Yes, by Saint Ann! an' ginger-hot in the mouth, too!"

[Prolonged laughter.]

And so the saddle of the rump nomination is put upon his back, and the whole ghastly pack of office-hunters jump upon it. The spurs are put to the flanks—the whip applied to the back of the panting, bleeding jade, and so the spectral ride goes, east and west, night and day—and may the steed go to perdition, if only the riders reach their goal. [Loud applause and cheers.]

Oh, there is justice in history. He has at last the idol of his dreams—the object of his fondest wishes—for which he has laid so many a treacherous scheme—for which he has turned so many a summersault—for which he has struck so many a blow at the peace of the Republic—for which he so often prostituted himself and his followers—for which he has hugged so many a loafer, and insulted so many an honest man—for which he made every rum-shop his headquarters, and every ruffian his friend:—he has at last the nomination for the Presidency; but what he has craved as a blessing, has come down upon him as a curse. To be nominated, and know that an election is impossible! To be voted for, and to know that every vote for him is for Breckinridge or Lane, whom he hates, and every vote against him a vote for Lincoln, whom he does not love! To be voted for, and be aware that those who vote for him work not for him, but for themselves! To be dead, and yet living enough to be conscious of death! Oh, there is justice in history! Am I exaggerating? Where is that mighty leader, whose voice once called millions into the field? At the street corners and cross-roads you see him standing like a blind, downfallen Belisarius—not in virtue, but in poverty—a bevy of political harlots surrounding him, and begging for the miserable obolus of a vote; begging the Know-Nothings, whom he once affected to despise; begging the Whigs, whom he once insulted with his brawling denunciations; invoking the spirit of Henry Clay, whom he once called a black-hearted traitor! Oh, but poor Belisarius! The party harlots that surround him with their clamorous, begging cry, steal every vote they receive for him, and put it into their own pockets.

Where is the bold, powerful agitator, whose voice sounded so defiantly on every contested field? Behold him on his sentimental journey, vainly trying to find his mother's home and his father's grave, apologising with squeamish affectation for his uncalled-for and indecent appearance in public, like one of the condemned spirits you read of in the myths of by-gone ages, restlessly perambulating the world, condemned to a more terrible punishment than Tantalus, who was tortured by an unearthly thirst, with grapes and water within his reach—more terrible than that of Dannites, who had to pour water into the leaky cask—for he is condemned to deliver that old speech of his over and over again. [Applause and cheers and laughter.] As often as he arrives at a hotel that has a balcony, as often as his hasty journey is arrested by a spontaneous gathering, when you hear a subterranean spectral voice cry out "my great principle of non-intervention"—that is the dead squatter sovereign atoning for the evil deeds he committed in his bodily existence. [Prolonged laughter and cheers.] Not long ago he haunted the railroad crossings and clam-bakes of New England; then the cross-roads of the South, and the ghastly apparition was last seen in this neighborhood. [Prolonged laughter and cheers.] Where is that formidable party tyrant whose wishes once were commands; who broke down sacred compromises with a mere stroke of his finger; whose very nod made the heads of those who displeased him fly into the basket; whose very whims were tests of Democracy? Where is he who once, like Mac-

beth, thought himself invulnerable by any man "who was of woman born;" invincible, great,

——— "Till Birnam wood
Do hie to Dunsinane hill,
Should come against him."

Like Macbeth, he has believed the fiends

"That paltered with him in a double sense,"

and there he stands, tied to the stake of his nomination.

"He cannot fly,
And, bear like, he must fight his course."

But as Birnam Wood marched to Dunsinane, so the very fence rails of Illinois are rushing down upon him [tremendous laughter and cheers], and, like Macduff, there rises against the spirit of Free Labor, one whose children he has murdered, and that is a Champion "not of woman born." [Laughter.] And now

"On, Macduff;
And damned be he who first cries hold—enough."

[Renewed laughter, and cheers.] Oh, there is justice in history. [Cheers.]

The same betrayal of the Free Labor cause—the Nebraska bill, which was to be his stepping stone to power, proved to be the abyss which engulfed his honor, his manhood, his strength and his hopes. There are those who mean to reverse the judgment of history. Vain undertaking! That man is marked by the hand of eternal retribution. On his very front stands the fatal touch. Do not attempt to arrest the hand of Supreme Justice. You cannot save him from his ruin. Why are you so eager to share his disgrace? Leaders of the Douglas Democracy, what means your empty bravado of strength? You cannot deceive others; why are you working so hard to deceive yourselves? You know that your orators are but endeavoring to galvanize a dead body into artificial life. You are well aware that your mass-meeting demonstrations are nothing but huge galvanic batteries at play. What means your desperate attempt to glue your broken fortunes together with those of other parties? Do you think this is the way to cheat destiny out of its dues? Is it your ambition to have your descendants read in the history of our days, there were men living in 1860 that with instincts so depraved that when they could not accomplish that which was evil, they endeavored at least, to prevent that which was good?

And you who are warned by this sacred voice of conscience that you are doing wrong in adhering to Douglas, and yet obey the command of party, hear me: Is this party drill a discipline so omnipotent an idol that you would sacrifice upon its altar your independence, your manhood and all that constitutes your moral worth?

And you who claim the exclusive privilege of swearing by the Constitution and the laws, will you stamp the evidences of hypocrisy upon your brow by indirectly indorsing him who has done more than any other living man to undermine the Constitution and pervert the laws? Will you permit your political hucksters to barter away not only your votes, but your consciences and your honor.

But let the conspirators come on: we defy them. Go on with your coalitions, which are made the distinct understanding that those who unite to-day are to cheat each other to-morrow. Has it become a ruling principle in your parties that the "rank and file have no rights which the "leaders are bound to respect?" You will find out your mistake. Look around you. Do you see thousands leaving your banners, unwilling to submit to your treacherous schemes, to rob the people of their elections. Do you know what that means? It means that the man rises above the partisan. It means the revival of conscience in our politics. It is the true sovereignty of the people vindicating itself. [Cheers.]

Now, build up your mole-hills, and call them impregnable fortresses. It seems you do not know how small they are. The logic of things will not roll its massive will over them. Your puny contrivances will leave no trace behind to tell your doleful story.

Sir, only those whose hearts are unmoved by great moral impulses can fail to see that we are in the midst of a great moral revolution. They cannot prevent final victory. I firmly believe they cannot retard it. No, they are aiding it in spite of themselves; for their general rottenness demonstrates its necessity. Douglas himself is powerfully promoting its progress. He has taught the people of America a great, sublime lesson.

I think it was Senator Pugh who once said that if Douglas were struck down by the South, he would take his bleeding corpse and show it to the youth of the North-West as an example of Southern gratitude. Let that modern Mark Antony come in with his dead Cæsar (pardon me, it is neither Cæsar dead nor Mark Antony living), let him bring in his bleeding corpse, and I would suggest the funeral oration. Let him say to the youth of the American Republic: "This is Douglas. Look at him. For every "wound the South inflicted upon him, he has "struck a blow at the liberties of his country-"men. Let him serve as a warning example that "a man may be a traitor to liberty, and yet not "become a favorite of the Slave Power. Mark "him. By false Popular Sovereignty he tried to "elevate himself; a true Popular Sovereignty "strikes him down." [Loud applause.]

If the youth of America profit by this lesson, then it may be said that even Douglas has done some service to his country. [Laughter.] Then peace be with him—his mission is fulfilled.

But now we have to fulfill ours. False Popular Sovereignty is down. Freemen, it is for you to see to it, that true Popular Sovereignty triumph.

Citizens of New York, when after the adjournment of the Convention which nominated that great and good man Abraham Lincoln for the Presidency, I addressed the people of my State again for the first time, I said to them: "Let "Wisconsin stretch her hand across the great "lakes and grasp the hand of New York. Let "it be known that New York and Wisconsin, "who stood together to the last for Seward in "the Convention, will stand first and foremost in "the battle for Lincoln and Liberty." Wisconsin will redeem her pledge on the 6th of November. Men of New York we look to you for a response. [Prolonged cheering.]

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS, No. 17.

POLITICAL RECORD

OF

STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS

ON THE

SLAVERY QUESTION.

A Tract issued by the Illinois Republican State Central Committee.

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

CONTENTS:

PART I.....ANTI-SLAVERY. | PART II.....PRO-SLAVERY. | PART III.....MISCELLANEOUS.

PART I.—ANTI-SLAVERY.

MR. DOUGLAS ENDEAVORS TO PROHIBIT SLAVERY IN "STATES."

On the 25th day of January, 1845, the Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, a member of the House of Representatives from Illinois, introduced the following amendment to the joint resolution for the annexation of Texas, which had been presented by Mr. Brown, of Tennessee:

"And in such *States* as may be formed out of said *territory* north of the Missouri Compromise line, slavery or involuntary servitude—except for crime—shall be prohibited."

The record of this action is found in the *Congressional Globe*, vol. XIV., (2d session, 28th Congress.) page 193. The amendment became a part of the law for annexing Texas, and will be found on page 798 of the *U. S. Statutes at Large*, for 1836—1845. Let it be observed, that while Thomas Jefferson and the fathers of the Republic proposed to prohibit slavery in *Territories* only, and while the Republican party of to-day propose no more and no less, Stephen A. Douglas sought in 1845, to prohibit it in *States*, even though the people wanted it!

HE DISTINCTLY ASSERTS THE RIGHT OF CONGRESS TO GOVERN THE TERRITORIES.

On the 23d of February, 1845, Mr. Douglas made a speech in the House of Representatives, on the bills for the admission of Iowa and Florida into the Union. In this speech he said:

"The father may bind his son during his minority, but the moment he attains his majority his fetters are severed, and he is free to regulate his own conduct. SO WITH THE TERRITORIES; THEY ARE SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION AND CONTROL OF CONGRESS DURING THEIR INFANCY—THEIR MINORITY; but when they attain their majority AND OBTAIN ADMISSION INTO THE UNION, they are free from all restraints and restrictions, except such as the Constitution of the United States has imposed upon each and all of the States."—*Cong. Globe, vol.* 14, *page* 284.

HE REGARDS THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE AS A "SACRED THING."

On the 23d of October, 1849, Mr. Douglas made a speech at Springfield, Illinois, which was published in the *State Register*, of November 8th, in which he used the following remarkable language:

"The Missouri Compromise has an origin akin to that of the Constitution of the United States, conceived in the same spirit of fraternal affection, and calculated to remove forever the danger which seemed to threaten, at some distant day, to sever the social bond of union. All the evidences of public opinion, at that day, seemed to indicate that this Compromise had became canonized in the hearts of the American people as a sacred thing, which no ruthless hand would ever be reckless enough to disturb."

HE AWARDS THE GLORY OF THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE TO HENRY CLAY.

In the same speech, and in the same context, he continued as follows:

"The Missouri Compromise had then been in practical operation for about a quarter of a century, and had received the sanction and approbation of men of all parties, in every section of the Union. It had allayed all sectional jealousies and irritations, growing out of this vexed question, and harmonized and tranquilized the whole country. It had given to Henry Clay, as its prominent champion, the proud sobriquet of the '*Great Pacificator*,' and by that title, and for that service, his political friends had repeatedly appealed to the people to rally under his standard, as a presidential candidate, as the man who had exhibited the patriotism, and the power to suppress an unholy and treasonable agitation, and preserve the Union. He (Mr. Douglas) was not aware that any man or any party, from any section of the Union, had ever urged,

☞FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF THE ALBANY EVENING JOURNAL. PRICE, PER SINGLE COPY, 2c.; PER DOZEN COPIES, 20c.; PER HUNDRED, $1; PER THOUSAND, $8.

as an objection to Mr. Clay, that he was a Great Champion of the Missouri Compromise. On the contrary, the effort was made by the opponents of Mr. Clay to prove that he was not entitled to the exclusive merit of that great patriotic measure, and that the honor was equally due to others as well as him, for securing its adoption.

"He (Mr. Douglas) in connection with the entire delegation from Illinois, and according to his recollection, in company with nearly all the members from the Northern States, and some forty odd members from the Slave States, voted for the Oregon bill, containing a prohibition of slavery in that Territory, leaving the people to regulate their own domestic institutions under the Constitution *when they should become a State*. This triumphant vote, uniting both Northern and Southern members in favor of the Oregon bill, was a matter of no practical importance so far as the existence of the institution of slavery in that country was concerned, and is only referred to now, for the purpose of showing that at that day, the Constitutional right of Congress to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories, WAS NOT VIRTUALLY RESISTED, IF, INDEED, IT WAS SERIOUSLY QUESTIONED."

HE BELIEVES IT IS NOT UNJUST TO THE SOUTH TO EXCLUDE SLAVERY.

On the 13th day of March, 1850, Mr. Douglas made a speech in the Senate, defending the "sacred thing," from which the following is an average extract:

"The next in the series of aggressions complained of by the Senator from South Carolina, is the Missouri Compromise. The Missouri Compromise an act of Northern injustice, designed to deprive the South of her due share of the Territories! Why, sir, it was only on this very day that the Senator from Mississippi despaired of any peaceable adjustment of existing difficulties, because the Missouri Compromise line could not be extended to the Pacific. That measure was originally adopted in the bill for the admission of Missouri, by the union of Northern and Southern votes. The South has always professed to be willing to abide by it, and even to continue it, as a fair and honorable adjustment of a vexed and difficult question. In 1845, it was adopted in the resolutions for the annexation of Texas, by Southern as well as Northern votes, without the slightest complaint that it was unfair to any section of the country. In 1846, it received the support of every Southern member of the House of Representatives—Whig and Democrat—without exception, as an alternative measure to the Wilmot Proviso. And again in 1848, as an amendment to the Oregon bill, *on my motion*, it received the vote, if I recollect right—and I do not think that I can possibly be mistaken—of every Southern Senator, Whig and Democrat, even including the Senator from South Carolina himself [Mr. CALHOUN]. And yet we are now told that this is only second to the Ordinance of 1787 in the series of aggressions on the South."—*Cong. Globe, Appendix, vol.* 22, *part* 1, *page* 370.

"The Territories belong to the United States as one people, one nation, and are to be disposed of for the common benefit of all, according to the principles of the Constitution. Each State, as a member of the Confederacy, has a right to a voice in forming the rules and regulations for the government of the Territories; but the different sections—North, South, East and West—have no such right. IT IS NO VIOLATION OF SOUTHERN RIGHTS TO PROHIBIT SLAVERY."—*Cong. Globe, Appendix, vol.* 22, *part* 1, *page* 369.

HE ADVOCATES THE "IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT" AND THE ULTIMATE EXTINCTION OF SLAVERY!

On the same day, and in the same speech, Mr. Douglas continued in the following surprising strain—surprising, if we reflect *in whose mouth* the sentiments are found:

"I have already had occasion to remark, that, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, there were twelve (slave States), and six of them have since abolished slavery. This fact shows that the cause of freedom has steadily and firmly advanced, while slavery has receded in the same ratio. We all look forward with confidence to the time when Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, and probably North Carolina and Tennessee, *will adopt one gradual system of emancipation*, under the operation of which, those States must, in process of time, become free."

And again, on the same page, speaking of a proposition to amend the Constitution so as to preserve an "equilibrium," in point of numbers, between free and slave States, he says:

"Then, sir, the proposition of the Senator from South Carolina is entirely impracticable. It is also inadmissible, if practicable. It would revolutionize the fundamental principle of the Government. It would destroy the great principle of popular equality which must necessarily form the basis of all free institutions. *It would be a retrograde movement, in an age of progress, that would astonish the world.*"—*Cong. Globe, Appendix, vol.* 22, *part* 1, *page* 371.

HE BELIEVES THAT CONGRESS MAY RIGHTFULLY EXCLUDE SLAVES, BANKS, OR ARDENT SPIRITS FROM THE TERRITORIES.

On the 13th of March, 1850, in the speech already quoted from, Mr. Douglas distinctly asserted the right of *Congress* to prohibit the introduction of certain species of property in the Territories, as being "unwise, immoral, and contrary to the principles of sound public policy," among which he enumerated property in slaves. He said:

"But you say that we propose to prohibit by law your emigrating to the Territories with your property. WE PROPOSE NO SUCH THING. We recognize your right, in common with our own, to emigrate to the Territories with your property, and there to hold and enjoy it in subordination to the laws you may find in force in the country. These laws, in some respects, differ from our own, as the laws of the various States of this Union vary, on some points, from the laws of each other. *Some species of property are excluded by law in most of the States, as well as Territories, as being unwise, immoral*, OR CONTRARY TO THE PRINCIPLES OF SOUND PUBLIC POLICY. For instance, the banker is prohibited from emigrating to Minnesota, Oregon or California with his bank. The bank may be property by the laws of New York, but ceases to be so when taken into a State or Territory where banking is prohibited by the local law. So, ardent spirits, whiskey, brandy, and all the intoxicating drinks, are recognized and considered as property in most of the States, if not all of them; but no citizen, whether from the North or South, can take this species of property with him, and hold, sell or use at his pleasure, in all the Territories, because it is prohibited by the local law—in Oregon by the statutes of the Territory, and in the Indian country by the acts of Congress. NOR CAN A MAN GO THERE AND TAKE AND HOLD HIS SLAVE, FOR THE SAME REASON. These laws, and many others involving similar principles, *are directed against no section*, AND IMPAIR THE RIGHTS OF NO STATE OF THE UNION. They are laws against the introduction, sale and use of specific kinds of property, whether brought from the North or the South, or from foreign countries."—*Cong. Globe, Appendix, vol.* 22, *part* 1, *page* 371.

And again:

"But, sir, I do not hold the doctrine, that, to exclude any species of property, by law, from any Territory, is a violation of any right to property. Do you not exclude banks from most of the Territories? Do you not exclude whiskey from being introduced into large portions of the territory of the United States? Do you not exclude gambling tables, which are properly recognized as such in the States where they are tolerated? And has any one contended that the exclusion of gambling tables, and the exclusion of ardent spirits, was a violation of any constitutional privilege or right? And yet it is the case in a large portion of the territory of the United States; but there is no outcry against that, because it is the prohibition of a specific kind of property, and not a prohibition against any section of the Union. Why, sir, our laws now prevent a tavern-keeper from going into some of the territories of the United States and taking a bar with him, and using and selling spirits there. The law also prohibits certain other descriptions of business from being carried on in the Territories. I am not, therefore, prepared to say that, under the Constitution, *we have not the power to pass laws excluding Negro Slavery from the Territories.* IT INVOLVES THE SAME PRINCIPLES."—*Speech of Senator Douglas, June* 3, 1850, *pages* 1115 *and* 1116, *vol.* 21, *Cong. Globe*, 1849-50.

HE BELIEVES IT IS CONSTITUTIONAL TO PROHIBIT SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.

On the same day, and in the same speech, Mr. Douglas referred to the Wilmot Proviso resolutions, passed by the Illinois Legislature, thus:

"My hands are tied upon one isolated point.

"A SENATOR—Can you not break loose?

"MR. DOUGLAS—*I have no desire to break loose.* My opinions are my own, and I express them freely. My votes belong to those who sent me here, and to whom I am responsible. I have never differed with my constituency during seven years' service in Congress, except upon one solitary question. AND EVEN ON THAT I HAVE NO CONSTITUTIONAL DIFFICULTIES, and have previously twice given the same vote, under peculiar circumstances, which is now required at my hands. *I have no desire, therefore, to break loose from the instruction.*"—[*Cong. Globe, Appendix, vol.* 22, *part* 1, *page* 373.]

THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE.

This is perhaps an appropriate place to introduce the Wilmot Proviso resolutions of the Illinois Legislature of 1849. They were adopted by the Senate on the 8th of January, in that year, and in the House on the 9th, in the following words:

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring. That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to use all honorable means in their power to procure the enactment of such laws by Congress for the government of the countries and territories of the United States acquired by the treaty of peace, friendship, limits and settlement with the Republic of Mexico, concluded February 2d, 1848, as shall contain the *express declaration 'that there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in said territories*, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted.'

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring herein.* That the Governor be respectfully requested to transmit to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress a copy of the joint resolution of the Senate, concurred in by the House on the 9th inst., for the exclusion of slavery from the new territories acquired by our late treaty with the Republic of Mexico."

MR. DOUGLAS RESPONDS TO THE RESOLUTIONS.

On the 23d of October, 1849, Mr. Douglas made a speech in Springfield, Ill. (referred to above), which was published in the *State Register*, of Nov. 8th, 1849. In this speech he referred to the resolutions of instructions passed by the Legislature, in the following language:

"In August, '48, he (Mr. Douglas) had voted for the Oregon bill, containing a clause prohibiting slavery in that Territory. About four months afterwards, the Legislature assembled and prepared a resolution instructing our Senators, and requesting our Representatives in Congress to vote for territorial bills in California and New Mexico, containing a prohibition of slavery in those Territories. In other words, *they instructed him to do precisely what he had just done without instructions.* He had been informed that his Whig friends, and perhaps a few others, peculiarly situated, confidently expected him to resign, rather than obey those instructions. It would be disagreeable to disappoint them in so reasonable an expectation. It was a serious question, however, requiring grave and deliberate consideration, whether he could conscientiously do under instructions WHAT HE HAD JUST DONE FROM THE DICTATES OF HIS JUDGMENT WITHOUT INSTRUCTIONS. As the decision of so important a question requires time to consider, he invited them to wait and see."

If it be denied that Mr. Douglas ever uttered these "Abolition" sentiments, a copy of the *Register* containing them, may be found on file in one of the public offices at Springfield, another at Jacksonville, and perhaps others in other parts of the State, though it is true that several files of the paper containing Mr. Douglas' speech of Oct. 23d, 1849, were quite mysteriously mutilated or destroyed in 1854, after the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

HE THOUGHT THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE SHOULD HAVE BEEN EXTENDED TO THE PACIFIC.

The bill for the admission of California being under debate, Mr. Turney (of Tenn.), moved to amend the same by extending the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific Ocean, saying his amendment was a verbatim copy of Douglas' amendment to the Oregon Bill. Mr. Douglas, on the 6th day of August, 1850, said:

"As reference has been made to me as the author of a similar amendment, in 1848, to the Oregon Bill, I desire only to state that I was then willing to adjust the whole slavery question on that line and those terms; *and if the whole acquired territory was now in the same condition as it was then*, I WOULD NOW VOTE FOR IT, AND SHOULD BE GLAD TO SEE IT ADOPTED. But since then California has increased her population, has a State government organized, and I cannot consent, for one, to destroy that State government and send all back, or that such a line as this shall form her southern boundary. For that reason, AND THAT ALONE, I shall vote against the amendment."—[*Cong. Globe, Appendix, vol.* 22, *part* 2, *page* 1510.

HE SAYS THE PEOPLE OF THE NORTHWEST WERE CONSCIENTIOUSLY OPPOSED TO SLAVERY.

In his speech in the Senate, on the 13th of March, 1850 (already quoted from), Mr. Douglas took occasion to vindicate the conscientious feelings of the people of Illinois and the other Northwestern States on the subject of slavery, as follows:

"I undertake to say that there is not one of these States that would have tolerated the institution of slavery in its limits, even if it had been peremptorily required to do so by act of Congress. It is a libel on the character of these people, to say that the HONEST SENTIMENTS OF THEIR HEARTS were smothered, and their political action upon this question constrained and directed by act of Congress. Will the Senators from Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa make any such DEGRADING ADMISSION in respect to their constituencies? I WILL NEVER BLACKEN THE CHARACTER OF MY OWN STATE BY SUCH AN ADMISSION, and I know the character of my colleague too well to harbor the thought that he will allow it to be said of her with impunity."—[*Cong. Globe, Appendix, vol.* 22, *part* 1, *page* 370.]

Let the reader contrast this fine assertion of the conscientious convictions of the people of Illinois, with the horrible libel upon them contained in his speech of February 29th, 1860 (on page 12 of this tract), and see how he has kept his promise, "never to blacken the character of his own State by such an admission."

HE BELIEVES IN THE HIGHER LAW.

In his Chicago speech of October 23d, 1850, in defense of the Fugitive Slave Law, Mr. Douglas said:

"The general proposition that there is a law PARAMOUNT TO ALL HUMAN ENACTMENTS—the law of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe—I TRUST THAT NO CIVILIZED AND CHRISTIAN PEOPLE IS PREPARED TO QUESTION, MUCH LESS DENY. We should recognize, respect and revere the Divine law."—*Sheahan's Life of Douglas, page* 184.

It is true that Mr. Douglas went on to argue that the Divine law does not prescribe the forms of human government, but all his subsequent logic is not a match for the plain, unequivocal statement here given that "there is a law paramount to all human enactments!"

SLAVERY IN NEW MEXICO.

For the purpose of contrasting the views uttered by Mr. Douglas in the Senate, on the 12th day of February, 1850, on the subject of slavery in the territory of New Mexico, with his remarks on the 16th of May, 1860, (hereafter quoted,) we copy the following from the *Congressional Globe, vol.* 22, *part* 1, *page* 343 :

"Mr. Douglas — If the question is controverted here, I am ready to enter into the discussion of that question at any time, upon a reasonable notice, and to show that, by the constituted authority and constitutional authority of Mexico, slavery was prohibited in New Mexico at the time of the acquisition, and that prohibition was acquired by us with the soil, and that, when we acquired the territory, we acquired it with that attached to it—that covenant running with the soil —and that must continue, unless removed by competent authority. And because there was a prohibition thus attached to the soil, I have always thought it was an unwise, unnecessary, and unjustifiable course on the part of the people of the free States to require Congress to put another prohibition on the top of that one. *It has been the strongest argument that I have ever urged against the prohibition of slavery in the Territories, that it was not necessary for the accomplishment of that object.*"

THE THREE NEBRASKA BILLS.

No. 1.

On the 17th day of February, A. D. 1853, Senator Douglas, as Chairman of the Committee on Territories, reported to the Senate his first "Act to Organize the Territory of Nebraska." This act contained no repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and it failed to become a law for want of time. Senator Atchison, of Missouri, on the 3d day of March, 1853, made some remarks on this bill, in which he acknowledged that he had no hope of ever seeing the Missouri Compromise repealed. He said :

"I had two objections to this bill. One was, that the Indian title to that territory had not been extinguished, or, at least, but a very small portion of it had been. Another was, the Missouri Compromise, or, as it is commonly called, the Slavery Restriction. It was my opinion at that time,—and I am not now very clear on that subject,—that the law of Congress, when the State of Missouri was admitted into the Union, excluding slavery from the territory of Louisiana north of 36 deg. 30 min., would be enforced in that territory unless it was specially rescinded; and whether that law was in accordance with the Constitution of the United States or not, it would do its work, and that work would be to preclude slaveholders from going into that territory. But when I came to look into that question, *I found that there was no prospect, no hope, of a repeal of the Missouri Compromise, excluding slavery from that Territory.* Now, sir, I am free to admit that, at this moment, at this hour, and for all time to come, I should oppose the organization or the settlement of that Territory, unless my constituents and the constituents of the whole South, of the slave States of the Union, could go into it upon the same footing, with equal rights and equal privileges, carrying that species of property with them as other people of this Union. Yes, sir, I acknowledge that that would have governed me; *but I have no hope that the restriction will ever be repealed.*

"I have always been of opinion that the first great error committed, in the political history of this country, was the Ordinance of 1787, rendering the Northwest Territory free territory. The next great error was the Missouri Compromise. *But they are both irremediable. There is no remedy for them. We must submit to them. I am prepared to do it.* It is evident that the Missouri Compromise cannot be repealed. So far as that question is concerned, we might as well agree to the admission of this Territory now as next year, or five or ten years hence."—*Cong. Globe, Session* 1852-53, *page* 1113.

No. 2.

On the 4th day of January, 1854, Mr. Douglas, as Chairman of the Committee on Territories, reported to the Senate his second bill for the organization of Nebraska. The bill was accompanied by a report, from which the following is an extract :

"Your Committee do not feel themselves called upon to enter into the discussion of these controverted questions. They involve the same grave issues which produced the agitation, the sectional strife, and the fearful struggle of 1850. As Congress deemed it wise and prudent to refrain from deciding the matters in controversy then, either by affirming or repealing the Mexican laws, or by an act declaratory of the true intent of the Constitution, and the extent of the protection afforded by it to slave property in the Territories, so *YOUR COMMITTEE ARE NOT PREPARED NOW TO RECOMMEND A DEPARTURE* from the course pursued on that memorable occasion, *EITHER BY AFFIRMING OR REPEALING THE EIGHTH SECTION OF THE MISSOURI ACT*, or by any act declaratory of the meaning of the Constitution in respect to the legal points of dispute."

Senator Dixon, of Kentucky, immediately introduced an amendment to the bill, declaring the Missouri Compromise null and void. Senator Atchison, of Missouri, then the presiding officer of the Senate, threatened Mr. Douglas with a displacement from his position as Chairman of the Committee on Territories unless he should accept Mr. Dixon's amendment. Mr. Atchison tells the whole story in a speech delivered at Atchison City, Kansas, on the 10th day of September, 1854, reported as follows in the Parkville *Luminary :*

"He [Atchison] thought the Missouri Compromise ought to be repealed; he had pledged himself in his public addresses to vote for no territorial organization that would not virtually annul it; and with this feeling in his heart, he desired to be the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories when a bill was introduced.

"With this object in view, he had a private interview with Mr. Douglas, and informed him of what he desired —the introduction of a bill for Nebraska like what he had promised to vote for, and that he would like to be Chairman of the Committee on Territories, in order to introduce such a measure; and if he could get that position, he would immediately resign as President of the Senate. Judge Douglas requested twenty-four hours to consider the matter, and if, at the expiration of that time, he could not introduce such a bill as he [Mr. Atchison] proposed, which would, at the same time, accord with his own sense of justice to the South, he would resign as Chairman of the Territorial Committee, in Democratic caucus, and exert his influence to get him [Atchison] appointed. At the expiration of the given time, Senator Douglas signified his intention to introduce such a bill as had been spoken of.'

No. 3

Whether Atchison told the truth or not, it is a fact that, on the 23d day of January, 1854, nineteen days after he was "not prepared to recommend a departure" from the Missouri prohibition, Mr. Douglas brought in a new bill, dividing Nebraska into two Territories—Kansas and Nebraska—and repealing the Missouri Compromise in the following terms :

"That the Constitution, and all the laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory of Nebraska (and Kansas) as elsewhere within the United States, except the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March sixth, eighteen hundred and twenty, which BEING INCONSISTENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF NON-INTERVENTION BY CONGRESS WITH SLAVERY IN THE STATES AND TERRITORIES, AS RECOGNIZED BY THE LEGISLATION OF 1850, commonly called the Compromise Measures, is hereby declared inoperative and void."

PART II.—PRO-SLAVERY.

The introduction of the third Nebraska bill, repealing the Missouri Compromise, constitutes the turning point in Mr. Douglas' political highway. From this sharp corner, his course is wholly and utterly pro-slavery, down to the introduction of the Lecompton bill in the Senate, where he takes a position of indifference, best expressed in his phrase, "Don't care whether slavery is voted down or voted up." The indifferent mood is preserved a little more than two years, when, as will be seen by the record, he becomes more wrathfully pro-slavery than ever before.

Popular Sovereignty.

The meaning of "Popular Sovereignity is now shown by Mr. Douglas himself to be this: That the people of a Territory shall not have the power of electing their own executive officers or judges, nor the right to make their own laws, except by a two-thirds vote, if the Federal Governor shall disapprove them; *and that they shall not have the right to exclude slavery at all.* It is further shown that under Popular Sovereignity "no such thing as sovereign power attaches to a Territory," and that the settlers upon all unorganized territory of the United States are to be treated as vagrants and rebels. In other words, that Popular Sovereignty means the right of the people of the Territories to be governed entirely by the President and the Supreme Court. Let the reader give his attention to the following facts, taken from the record, and judge whether this is not a correct statement of "Popular Sovereignty:"

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY IN THE NEBRASKA BILL.

The twelfth section of the Kansas-Nebraska Act says:

"That the Governor, Secretary, Chief Justice, Associate Justices, Attorney and Marshal, shall be nominated, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, *appointed by the President of the United States.*"

The sixth section of the same act says:

"Every bill which shall have passed the Council and House of Representatives of said Territory, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the Governor of the Territory; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it with his objections to the House in which it originated, who shall enter the objections, at large, on their journal, and proceed to re-consider it. If, after such re-consideration, TWO-THIRDS of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be re-considered, and, if approved by TWO-THIRDS of that House, it shall become a law."

The seventh section of the same act says:

"The Governor shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the legislative council, *appoint all officers not herein otherwise provided for;* and in the first instance the Governor alone may appoint all said officers who shall hold their offices until the end of the first session of the legislative assembly, and he shall lay off the necessary districts for members of the council and House of Representatives, and all other officers."

These extracts are introduced, not because there has ever been any dispute about the facts, but for the purpose of giving jury evidence of the proposition sought to be established concerning the "true intent and meaning" of Popular Sovereignty.

HE VOTES DOWN "POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY."

The true intent and meaning of the Nebraska bill was declared to be "not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people perfectly free to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." This was the "stump speech in the belly of the bill," as Mr. Benton justly characterized it. On the 15th of February, 1854, Senator Chase offered an amendment to the bill, in order to exclude slavery while in a Territorial condition, if they wanted to. The amendment was as follows:

"Mr. CHASE—I desire to submit an amendment—to insert immediately after the words, 'subject to the Constitution of the United States,' the following:

"'Under which the people of the Territory, through their appropriate representatives, may, if they see fit, PROHIBIT THE EXISTENCE OF SLAVERY THEREIN.'"—*Cong. Globe*, 1854, *part* 1, *page* 421.

After considerable discussion a vote was taken, on the 2d of March following, and the amendment was rejected by—yeas, 10, nays, 30—DOUGLAS voting in the negative. Thus, it appeared that the people were *not* left perfectly free to *exclude* slavery, according to Mr. Douglas' understanding of his own bill.

HE DOES IT AGAIN.

On the 2d of July, 1856, Senator Trumbull offered the following amendment to the bill for the admission of Kansas, commonly known as the "Toombs Bill:"

"And be it further enacted, That the provision of the Act to organize the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas,' which declares it to be the 'true intent and meaning' of said act 'not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States,' was intended to and does confer upon or leave to the people of Kansas full power, at any time, through its Territorial Legislature, to exclude slavery from said Territory, or to recognize and regulate it therein."

The vote stood—yeas 11, nays 34. DOUGLAS voting in the negative. The amendment may be found on page 796, and the vote on page 799 of the Appendix to the *Congressional Globe*, 1855–6.

HE SAYS IT IS A QUESTION FOR THE SUPREME COURT.

On this occasion (to wit, on the 2d of July, 1856), Mr. Douglas used the following language in discussing the amendment:

"My opinion in regard to the question which my colleague is trying to raise here, has been well known to the Senate for years. It has been repeated over and over again. He tried, the other day, as those asso-

ciated with him on the stump used to do two years ago and last year, to ascertain what were my opinions on this point in the Nebraska bill. I TOLD THEM IT WAS A JUDICIAL QUESTION. My answer then was, and now is, that IF THE CONSTITUTION CARRIES SLAVERY THERE, LET IT GO, AND NO POWER ON EARTH CAN TAKE IT AWAY; but if the Constitution does not carry it there, no power but the people can carry it there. Whatever may be the true decision on that constitutional point, it would not have affected my vote for or against the Nebraska bill. *I should have supported it as readily if I thought the decision would be one way as the other.* If my colleague will examine my speeches, he will find that declaration. He will also find that I stated I would not discuss the LEGAL QUESTION, for that by the bill we referred it to the Courts."—*Appendix to Cong. Globe, page* 797.

And again on the same day, in reply to Mr. Trumbull, he said:

"I say I am willing to leave it to the Supreme Court of the United States, because the Constitution intrusted it there.—*Appendix to Cong. Globe*, 1855-6, *page* 797.

WHAT THE SUPREME COURT DECIDED.

This is the proper place to give the decision of the Supreme Court on the question of slavery in the Territories, and the right of Territorial Legislatures to exclude it. It will be found on pages 450 and 451, vol. 19. Howard's Reports (Dred Scott *vs.* John F. A. Sanford), where, after deciding that Congress had no power to prohibit slavery in a Territory, the Court proceeded as follows:

"The powers over person and property of which we speak, are not only not granted to Congress, but are in express terms denied, and they are forbidden to exercise them. And this prohibition is not confined to the States, but the words are general, and extend to the whole territory over which the Constitution gives it power to legislate, including those portions of it remaining under Territorial Government, as well as that covered by States. It is a total absence of power everywhere within the dominion of the United States, and places the citizens of a Territory, so far as these rights are concerned, on the same footing with citizens of the States, and guards them as firmly and plainly against any inroads which the General Government might attempt, under the plea of implied or incidental powers. And if Congress itself cannot do this—if it is beyond the powers conferred on the Federal Government—*it will be admitted, we presume, that it could not authorize a Territorial Government to exercise them. It could confer no power on any local government established by its authority, to violate the provisions of the Constitution.*

"It seems, however, to be supposed that there is a difference between property in a slave and other property, and that different rules may be applied to it in expounding the Constitution of the United States. And the laws and usages of nations, and the writings of eminent jurists upon the relation of master and slave, and their mutual rights and duties, and the powers which governments may exercise over it, have been dwelt upon in the argument.

"But in considering the question before us, it must be borne in mind that there is no law of nations standing between the people of the United States and their government, and interfering with their relation to each other. The powers of the government, and the rights of the citizens under it, are positive and practical regulations plainly written down. The people of the United States have delegated to it certain enumerated powers, and forbidden it to exercise others. It has no power over the person or property of a citizen but what the citizens of the United States have granted. And no laws or usages of other nations, nor reasoning of statesmen or jurists, upon the relation of master and slave, can enlarge the powers of the government, or take from the citizens the rights they have reserved. And if the Constitution recognizes the right of property of the master in a slave, and makes no distinction between that description of property and other property owned by a citizen, *no tribunal, acting under the authority of the United States, whether it be legislative, executive or judicial, has a right to draw such a distinction, or deny to it the benefit of the provisions and guarantees which have been provided for the protection of private property against the encroachments of the government.*

"Now, as we have already said in an earlier part of this opinion, upon a different point, THE RIGHT OF PROPERTY IN A SLAVE IS DISTINCTLY AND EXPRESSLY AFFIRMED IN THE CONSTITUTION. The right of traffic in it, like an ordinary article of merchandise and property, was guaranteed to the citizens of the United States in every State that might desire it, for twenty years. And the Government in express terms is pledged to protect it in all future time, if the slave escapes from his owner. This is done in plain words, too plain to be misunderstood. And no word can be found in the Constitution which gives Congress a greater power over slave property, or which entitles property of that kind to less protection than property of any other description. *The only power conferred is the power coupled with the duty of guarding and protecting the owner in his rights.*"

POINTS ESTABLISHED BY THE DECISION.

In the 19th vol. of Howard's Reports, page 395, a syllabus of the Dred Scott decision, embracing the points established by the Court, is given in the following words:

1st. "The Territory thus acquired, is acquired by the people of the United States for their common and equal benefit, through their agent and trustee—the Federal Government. Congress can exercise no power over the rights of persons or property of a citizen in the Territory which is prohibited by the Constitution. The Government and the citizen, whenever the Territory is open to settlement, both enter with their respective rights defined and limited by the Constitution."

2d. "Congress has no right to prohibit citizens of any particular State or States, from taking up their homes there, while it permits citizens of other States to do so. Nor has it a right to give privileges to one class of citizens which it refuses to another. The Territory is acquired for their equal and common benefit, and if open to any, it must be open to all upon equal and the same terms."

3d. "EVERY CITIZEN HAS A RIGHT TO TAKE WITH HIM INTO THE TERRITORY ANY ARTICLE OF PROPERTY WHICH THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RECOGNIZES AS PROPERTY."

4th. "THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES REGULATES SLAVES AS PROPERTY, AND PLEDGES THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO PROTECT IT. And Congress cannot exercise any more authority over property of that description, than it may constitutionally exercise over property of any other kind."

5th. "The act of Congress, therefore, prohibiting a citizen of the United States taking with him his slaves when he removes to the Territory in question to reside, IS AN EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY OVER PRIVATE PROPERTY WHICH IS NOT WARRANTED BY THE CONSTITUTION, and the removal of the plaintiff, by his owner, to that Territory, gave him no title to freedom."

6th. "While it remains a Territory, Congress may legislate over it within the scope of its constitutional powers, in relation to citizens of the United States, and may establish a Territorial Government, and the form of this local government must be regulated by the discretion of Congress; but with powers not exceeding those which Congress itself, by the Constitution, is authorized to exercise over citizens of the United States, in respect to their rights of property."

Senator Benjamin, in his speech of May 22d, 1860, says that this syllabus was prepared and written out by Judge Taney himself.

MR. DOUGLAS INDORSES THE WHOLE DECISION.

The Dred Scott decision was delivered in March, 1857. Mr. Buchanan had just been inaugurated, and the Senate had just adjourned. Mr. Douglas took an early occasion to give in his adhesion, not only to the *decision* that Dred Scott was not a citizen, and therefore could not bring suit in a Circuit Court of the United States, but also to the *obiter dictum*, that neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature could prohibit slavery in a Territory. Having found a Grand Jury in session at Springfield, in the month of June following, an invitation was procured from that august body, calling for the views of Mr. Douglas

on three points, to wit: the Lecompton Convention in Kansas; the proposed invasion of Utah; and the Dred Scott Decision. On the last mentioned topic he spoke as follows:

"The character of Chief Justice Taney and the associate judges who concurred with him require no eulogy—or vindication from me. They are endeared to the people of the United States by their eminent public services—venerated for their great learning, wisdom and experience—and beloved for the spotless purity of their characters and their exemplary lives. The poisonous shafts of partisan malice will fall harmless at their feet, while their judicial decisions will stand in all future time, a proud monument to their greatness, the admiration of the good and wise, and a rebuke to the partisans of faction and lawless violence.

"The Court did not attempt to avoid responsibility by disposing of the case upon technical points without touching the merits, nor did they go out of their way to decide questions not properly before them and directly presented by the record, *Like honest and conscientious judges, as they are*, they met and decided each point as it arose, and faithfully performed their whole duty, and nothing but their duty, to their country, BY DETERMINING ALL THE QUESTIONS IN THE CASE, and nothing but what was essential to the decision of the case upon its merits."—*Douglas' Springfield Grand Jury Speech, June 12th, 1857—as is published in the State Register.*

HE BELIEVES THAT THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRIORIES ARE "HELD IN ABEYANCE."

On the 12th of March, 1856, Mr. Douglas submitted his famous report, accompanying a bill for the admission of Kansas into the Union as a State. Senator Chase's amendment to the Nebraska bill, authorizing the people to exclude slavery while in a territorial condition, having been voted down, and the right of a Territorial Legislature to prohibit slavery having thus been denied, it became important to know whether, in Mr. Douglas' opinion, the *people* can in any other way exclude slavery prior to the formation of a State Constitution. On this point Mr. Douglas is very explicit in denying the right. In the report here referred to he says:

"Without deeming it necessary to express any opinion on this occasion, in reference to that [the Rhode Island] controversy, it is evident that the principles upon which it was conducted are not involved in the revolutionary struggle now going on in Kansas; FOR THE REASON THAT THE SOVEREIGNTY OF A TERRITORY REMAINS IN ABEYANCE SUSPENDED IN THE UNITED STATES, IN TRUST FOR THE PEOPLE, UNTIL THEY SHALL BE ADMITTED INTO THE UNION AS A STATE."—*Douglas' Report on Kansas Affairs, March 12, 1856, page 39.*

This remarkable statement, taken by itself, would seem to be an open avowal of the Republican doctrine that Congress is the rightful guardian of the Territories until they are prepared for admission into the Union as States, but taken with the context, it is no less than a foreshadowing of the Dred Scott decision. In other words, it denies that species of "sovereignty" to the Territories which authorizes them to *exclude* slavery, and holds them on this point rigidly "subject to the Constitution of the United States," as interpreted by the Supreme Court. It is conclusive, however, of one thing, to wit, that "*the sovereignty of a Territory remains in abeyance*"—that the people cannot do the things which Mr. Douglas himself proclaimed they might do—that they cannot do those things either through a Territorial Legislature or by Mass Convention, for the reason that their sovereignty is "suspended in the United States, in trust for the people, UNTIL THEY SHALL BE ADMITTED INTO THE UNION AS A STATE."

HE SAYS THAT SLAVES ARE RECOGNIZED AS "PROPERTY" BY THE CONSTITUTION.

On the 6th of December, 1858, Mr. Douglas spoke at New Orleans. The following quotation from his speech is taken from the report in the New Orleans *Delta:*

"I, in common with the Democracy of Illinois, accept the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Dred Scott case, as an authoritative exposition of the Constitution. Whatever limitations the Constitution, as expounded by the Courts, impose on the authority of a Territorial Legisture, we cheerfully recognize and respect in conformity with that decision. *Slaves are recognized as property, and placed on an equal footing with all other property. Hence, the owner of Slaves—the same as the owner of any other species of property—has a right to remove to a Territory and carry his property with him.*"

HE REPEATS THAT SLAVES MAY BE TAKEN TO THE TERRITORIES LIKE OTHER PROPERTY.

Some of the Douglas organs in the North have undertaken to say that their champion never uttered the words quoted above from his New Orleans speech. They will hardly deny, however, that he repeated it even more offensively in the Senate, on the 23d of February, 1859, in a debate with Jeff. Davis, when he said:

"I do not put slavery on a different footing from other property. I recognize it as property under what is understood to be the decision of the Supreme Court. I argue that the owner of slaves HAS THE SAME RIGHT TO REMOVE TO THE TERRITORIES AND CARRY HIS SLAVE PROPERTY WITH HIM AS THE OWNER OF ANY OTHER SPECIES OF PROPERTY, and hold the same, subject to such local laws as the Territorial legislature may constitutionally pass, and if any person shall feel aggrieved by such local legislation, he may appeal to the Supreme Court to test the validity of such laws. I recognize slave property to be *on an equality with all other property*, and apply the same rules to it. I will not apply one rule to slave property, and another to all other kinds of property."—*Cong. Globe*, 1858-9, *part* 2, *page* 1256.

And again:

"Slaves, according to that decision, being property, stand on an equal footing with all other property. THERE IS JUST AS MUCH OBLIGATION ON THE PART OF THE TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE TO PROTECT SLAVES AS EVERY OTHER SPECIES OF PROPERTY, AS THERE IS TO PROTECT HORSES, CATTLE, DRY GOODS, LIQUORS, &c."—*Cong. Globe, same vol., page* 1258.

And again:

"Hence, under the Constitution, there is no power to prevent a Southern man going into the Territories with his slaves, more than a Northern man."—*Mr. Douglas' Memphis Speech, Nov.* 29, 1858, *as published in the Avalanche.*

WHAT HE IS OBLIGED TO DO IN THE PREMISES.

In his letter replying to Judge Black's criticism on his Harpers' Magazine article, Mr. Douglas took pains to tell what he deemed all persons obliged to do who hold that slavery exists in the Territories by virtue of the Constitution. He said:

"In that article, without assailing any one, or impugning any man's motive, I demonstrated, beyond the possibility of cavil or dispute, if slavery exists in the Territories by virtue of the Constitution, the conclusion is inevitable and irresistible, THAT IT IS THE IMPERATIVE DUTY OF CONGRESS TO PASS ALL LAWS NECESSARY FOR ITS PROTECTION; THAT THERE IS AND CAN BE NO EXCEPTION TO THE RULE, THAT A RIGHT GUARANTEED BY THE CONSTITUTION MUST BE PROTECTED BY LAW IN ALL CASES WHERE LEGISLATION IS ESSENTIAL TO ITS ENJOYMENT. That all who believe that *slavery exists in the Territories by virtue of the Constitution* are bound by their conscience, and oaths

of fidelity to the Constitution, *to support a Congressional slave-code in the Territories.*"

This direct and unequivocal statement of the duty of those who believe that slavery exists in the Territories by virtue of the Constitution, narrows the whole controversy between Douglas and Breckinridge down to a quibble, to wit: Is the right to carry slave property into the Territories, which Mr. Douglas concedes in the extracts quoted above, equivalent to the existence of slavery in the Territories by virtue of the Constitution? To use the brief and concise phrase employed by Mr. Lincoln in his Columbus speech, "Can a thing be lawfully driven away from a place where it has a lawful right to be?" Which faction of the Democracy has the advantage of logic and truthfulness in this controversy?

HE DROPS "POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY" ALTOGETHER.

Mr. Douglas has so frequently reindorsed the Dred Scott decision, that it is hardly worth while to notice his subsequent remarks on that theme. Let it be observed, however, that, after the Illinois election of 1858, Mr. Douglas ceased talking about the right of Territorial Legislatures to *exclude* slavery, but commenced on an entirely new theme, to wit: "the right of the people to control slavery as *property.*" On the 22d of June, 1859, Mr. Douglas wrote the following letter to J. B. Dorr, Esq., the editor of the Dubuque Herald, which was immediately telegraphed all over the country as the groundwork of principles on which he would be willing to accept the nomination of the Charleston Convention:

"*Washington, June* 22, 1859.

"MY DEAR SIR—I have received your letter inquiring whether my friends are at liberty to present my name to the Charleston Convention for the Presidential nomination.

"Before this question can finally be determined, it will be necessary to understand distinctly upon what issues the canvass is to be conducted. If, as I have full faith they will, the Democratic party shall determine, in the Presidential election of 1860, to adhere to the principles embodied in the Compromise measures of 1850, and ratified by the people in the Presidential election of 1852, and reaffirmed in the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, and incorporated into the Cincinnati Platform in 1856, as expounded by Mr. Buchanan in his letter accepting the nomination, and approved by the people in his election,—in that event, my friends will be at liberty to present my name to the Convention, if they see proper to do so. If, on the contrary, it shall become the policy of the Democratic party, which I cannot anticipate, to repudiate these, their time-honored principles, on which we have achieved so many patriotic triumphs, and in lieu of them the Convention shall interpolate into the creed of the party such new issues as the revival of the slave-trade, or a Congressional slave-code for the Territories, or the doctrine that the Constitution of the United States ever established or prohibited slavery in the Territories *beyond the power of the people legally to control it as property*—it is due to candor to say, that, in such an event, I could not accept the nomination, if tendered to me. Trusting that this answer will be deemed sufficiently explicit, I am, very respectfully,

"Your friend, S. A. DOUGLAS.

"J. B. DORR, Esq., Dubuque, Iowa."

Probably the best exposition which has been made of this new dogma is found in Mr. Lincoln's speech delivered at Columbus, Ohio, in September, 1859, where he noticed the change in Mr Douglas' tone as follows:

"What he says now is something different in language, and we will consider whether it is not different in sense too. It is, now, that the Dred Scott decision, or rather the Constitution under that decision, does not carry slavery into the Territories beyond the power of the people of the Territories *to control it as other property.* He does not say that people can drive it out, but they can control it as other property. The language is different: we should consider whether the sense is different. Driving a horse out of this lot is too plain a proposition to be mistaken about: it is putting him on the other side of the fence. Or it might be a sort of exclusion of him from the lot if you were to kill him and let the worms devour him; but neither of these things is the same as 'controlling him as other property.' That would be to feed him, to pamper him, to ride him, to use and abuse him, to make the most money out of him 'as other property;' but please you, what do the men who are in favor of slavery want more than this? What do they really want, other than that slavery, being in the Territories, shall be controlled as other property?"

HE GOES FOR SUPREME COURT SOVEREIGNTY.

In his speech of February 23d, 1859, already referred to, Mr. Douglas again declared himself ready to follow the Supreme Court to the crushing out of Popular Sovereignty. He said:

"When the Supreme Court shall decide upon the constitutionality of the local [Territorial] laws, I AM PREPARED TO ABIDE BY THE DECISION WHATEVER IT MAY BE, AND HAVE IT EXECUTED IN GOOD FAITH AS WELL AS IN OTHER CASES." *Cong. Globe*, 1858–59, *part* 2, *page* 1259.

And again in his speech of May 16th, 1860, having read the Tennessee Compromise resolution offered at the Charleston Convention, which was as follows:

"That all citizens of the United States have an equal right to settle with their property in the Territory, and that *under the decision of the Supreme Court* which we recognize as an exposition of the Constitution, neither their rights of person or property can be destroyed or impaired by Congressional or Territorial legislation."

—he proceeded to remark:

"The second proposition is, that a right of person or property, secured by the Constitution, cannot be taken away by act of Congress or of the Territorial Legislature. Who ever dreamed that either Congress or a Territorial Legislature, or any other legislative body on earth could destroy or impair any right guaranteed or secured by the Constitution? No man that I know of."—*Appendix to the Cong. Globe*, 1859–60, *page* 316.

HE TELLS HOW TO CARRY OUT SUPREME COURT SOVEREIGNTY.

In the same speech (May 16th, 1860), he tells how to carry out Supreme Court Sovereignty, as follows:

"When that case shall arise, and the Court shall pronounce its judgment, it will be binding on me, on you, sir, and on every good citizen. It must be carried out in good faith; AND ALL THE POWER OF THIS GOVERNMENT—THE ARMY, THE NAVY, AND THE MILITIA—ALL THAT WE HAVE—MUST BE EXERTED TO CARRY THE DECISION INTO EFFECT IN GOOD FAITH, IF THERE BE RESISTANCE."—*Appendix to Cong. Globe*, 1859—60, *page* 311.

HE IS UTTERLY OPPOSED TO "SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY."

In a colloquy with Senators Davis and Gwin, in the Senate, on the 17th of May, 1860, Mr. Douglas utterly repudiated "squatter sovereignty," in the following words:

"Regarding Squatter Sovereignty as a nickname invented by the Senator and those with whom he acts, which I have never recognized, I must leave him to define the meaning of his own term. I have denounced Squatter Sovereignty when you find it setting up a Government in violation of law, as you do now at Pike's Peak. I denounced it this year. When you find an unauthorized Legislature, in violation of law, setting up a Government without sanction of Congress or Court, that is Squatter Sovereignty which I oppose. There is the case of Dakotah, where you have left a whole people without any law or territorial organization, with no mode of appeal from Squatter Courts to the United States Courts to correct their decisions—that is Squatter Sovereignty in violation of the Constitution and laws of the United States. There is a similar government set up over a part of California

and a part of the Territory of Utah, called Nevada. It has a delegate here, claiming to represent it. I have denounced that as unlawful. I am opposed to all such Squatter Sovereignty. If that is what the Senator referred to, I am against it. All I say is, the people of a Territory, when they have become organized under the Constitution and laws, have legislative power over all rightful subjects of legislation consistent with the Constitution of the United States. That is the language of the law, and if they exercise legislative powers on any subject inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States, the courts, to whom appeal may be taken under the laws, will correct their errors. That is all.—*Cong. Globe*, 1859-60, *page* 2147.

HE REPUDIATES TERRITORIAL SOVEREIGNTY ALSO.

The following extract from Mr. Douglas' letter in reply to Judge Black's criticism on his Harpers' Magazine essay, puts everything at sixes and sevens again as regards his views of the sovereignty which belongs to the people of a Territory. In that letter he says :

"I have never said or thought that our Territories were sovereign political communities, or even limited sovereignties, like the States of this Union."

And again, in a colloquy with Mr. Clay, of Alabama, in the Senate, February 23, 1859, he was still more explicit in denying sovereignty to the Territories :

"I will answer the Senator's question. First: I do not hold that squatter sovereignty is superior to the Constitution. I HOLD THAT NO SUCH THING AS SOVEREIGN POWER ATTACHES TO A TERRITORY WHILE A TERRITORY. I hold that a Territory possesses whatever power it derives from the Constitution, under the organic act, and no more. I hold that ALL the power that a Territorial Legislature possesses is derived from the Constitution and its amendments, *under the acts of Congress;* and because I held that, I denied last year that the people of a Territory, *without the consent of Congress*, could assemble at Lecompton and create an organic law for that people. I denied the validity of your Lecompton Constitution, for the reason that Constitutions can only be made by sovereign power, and because the Territory was not a sovereignty, that was not a Constitution, but a petition."—*Cong. Globe*, 1858-59, *part* 2, *page* 1246.

It will be noticed, also, that, in these remarks, Mr. Douglas supplied a link hitherto missing in the chain which binds him to the Dred Scott decision. It is this : the Supreme Court say, that, whereas Congress cannot prohibit slavery in the Territory, it cannot delegate such power to a Territorial Legislature. Mr. Douglas steps in at this point and says that ALL the powers vested in a Territory are derived through the act of Congress organizing it. They have no powers that are not so derived. Hence, if Congress cannot prohibit slavery in a Territory, neither can the people of the Territory do so by any means whatever.

A QUESTION WHICH HE WILL NOT ANSWER.

In his colloquy with Mr. Davis, in the Senate, May 17, 1860, Mr. Douglas refused to answer the question, whether he would or would not sign a bill to protect slave property in the Territories, if he were President of the United States. This is a question which has an immediate and special significance, and one which each voter has a right to put to Mr. Douglas and every other candidate for President or Vice-President. Fortunately, we have Mr. Douglas' reply, or his refusal to reply, on record. The colloquy was as follows :

"Mr. DAVIS—If it will not embarrass the Senator, I would ask him if, as Chief Executive of the United States, he would sign a bill to protect slave property in State, Territory, or District of Columbia—an act of Congress.

"Mr. DOUGLAS—It will be time enough for me or any other man to say what bills he will sign when he is in a position to execute the power.

"Mr. DAVIS—I shall not ask you a question further than you wish to answer—certainly not.

"Mr. DOUGLAS—The Senator can ask all the questions he pleases, and I shall answer them when I please; but I was going to say that I do not recognize the right to catechise me in this way. The Senator has no right to do it after sneering at my pretensions to the place which he assumes that I desire to occupy.

"Mr. DAVIS—I grant the Senator the right not to answer the question, though it seemed to me to be leading very directly up to an exact understanding between us as to what he meant by non-intervention. I, however, will not press that, or any other question, against his wishes."—*Cong. Globe*, 1859-60, *page* 2147.

HE GOES DIRECTLY FOR SUPREME COURT SOVEREIGNTY AND A TERRITORIAL SLAVE CODE.

On the 23d of June, 1860, the Douglas wing of the National Democratic Convention, at Baltimore, finished up its business by adopting the following resolution as a part of its platform,—the resolution having been offered by Mr. Wickliffe, of Louisiana, who declared that its adoption would give Mr. Douglas 40,000 votes in that State :

"*Resolved*, That it is in accordance with the Cincinnati platform, that during the existence of Territorial Governments, the measure of restriction, whatever it may be, imposed by the Federal Constitution on the power of the Territorial Legislature over the subject of the domestic relations, *as the same has been or shall hereafter be decided by the Supreme Court of the United States*, should be respected by all good citizens, and enforced with promptness and fidelity *by every branch of the General Government*."

In his letter accepting the nomination, Mr. Douglas gave his particular attention to the Wickliffe slave-code resolution, remarking upon it as follows :

"Upon a careful examination of the platform of principles adopted at Charleston and re-affirmed at Baltimore, with an additional resolution which is in *perfect harmony* with the others, I find it to be a faithful embodiment of the time-honored principles of the Democratic party, as the same were proclaimed and understood by all parties in the Presidential contests of 1848, 1852 and 1856."

Thus has squatter sovereignty at last been completely squatted out!

HE ENDEAVORS TO BRING KANSAS INTO THE UNION WITHOUT HAVING HER CONSTITUTION SUBMITTED TO THE PEOPLE.

On the 25th of June, 1856, while the bill for the admission of Kansas was pending in the Senate, Mr. Toombs, of Georgia, introduced an amendment, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the original bill and other amendments, recommended to the Committee on Territories, of which Mr. Douglas was Chairman. This amendment of Mr. Toombs, printed by order of the Senate, provided for the appointment of commissioners who were to take a census of Kansas, divide the Territory into election districts, and superintend the election of delegates to form a Constitution, and contains a clause in the 18th section requiring the Constitution which should be formed to be submitted to the people for adoption, as follows :

"That the following propositions be and the same are hereby offered to the said Convention of the people of Kansas, when formed, for their free acceptance or rejection, which, if accepted by the Convention, AND RATIFIED BY THE PEOPLE AT THE ELECTION FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE CONSTITUTION, shall be obligatory on the United States, and upon the said State of Kansas, etc."

This amendment of Mr. Toombs was referred to the committee of which Mr. Douglas was Chairman, and reported back by him on the 30th

of June, with the words "And ratified by the people at the election for the adoption of the Constitution" *stricken out*. On the 9th of December, 1857, Senator Bigler explained how the submission clause came to be stricken out, as follows:

"I was present when that subject was discussed by Senators, before the bill was introduced, and the question was raised and discussed whether the Constitution, when formed, should be submitted to a vote of the people. It was held by the most intelligent on the subject, that in view of all the difficulties surrounding that Territory, the danger of any experiment at that time of a popular vote, it would be better that THERE SHOULD BE NO SUCH PROVISION IN THE TOOMBS' BILL; and it is my understanding in all the intercourse I had, that that Convention would make a Constitution and send it here WITHOUT SUBMITTING IT TO THE POPULAR VOTE."—*Cong. Globe, part* 1, 1857-58, *page* 21.

Referring to same subject again on the 21st of December, 1857, Mr. Bigler continued:

"Nothing was further from my mind than to allude to any social or confidential interview. The meeting was not of that character. Indeed, it was semi-official, and called to promote the public good. My recollection was clear that I left the conference under the impression that it had been deemed best to adopt measures to admit Kansas as a State through the agency of one popular election, and that for delegates to the Convention. This impression was the stronger, because I thought the spirit of the bill infringed upon the doctrine of non-intervention, to which I had great aversion; but with the hope of accomplishing great good, and as no movement had been made in that direction in the Territory, I waived this objection, and concluded to support the measure. I have a few items of testimony as to the correctness of these impressions, and with their submission I shall be content. I have before me the bill reported by the Senator from Illinois, on the 7th of March, 1856, providing for the admission of Kansas as a State, the third section of which reads as follows:

"'That the following propositions be, and the same are hereby offered to the said Convention of the people of Kansas, when formed, for their free acceptance or rejection: which, if accepted by the Convention *and ratified by the people at the election for the adoption of the Constitution, shall* be obligatory upon the United States, and upon the said State of Kansas.'

"The bill read in place by the Senator from Georgia, on the 25th of June, and referred to the Committee on Territories, contained the same section, word for word. Both these bills were under consideration at the conference referred to, but, sir, when the Senator from Illinois reported the Toombs bill to the Senate, with amendments, the next morning, it did not contain that portion of the third section which indicated to the Convention that the Constitution should be approved by the people. The words 'and ratified by the people at the election for the adoption of the Constitution,' had been stricken out."—*Cong. Globe, part* 1, 1857-8, *pages* 113 *and* 114.

Better testimony, however, is that of Toombs himself, delivered in the Senate on the 18th of March, 1857, as follows:

"The first twelve sections provided the machinery for executing the (Toombs) bill, so that there should be no dispute as to its fairness.

"The other sections, containing only the formal parts of the bill, incident to every enabling act, I cut off with my scissors from a printed bill before me. The first twelve sections are in my own writing. In the thirteenth section, under the usual clause, stating that the following shall be the fundamental conditions of admission, THERE WERE WORDS REQUIRING A SUBMISSION OF THE CONSTITUTION TO THE PEOPLE. That I did not observe.

"When the bill came up for consideration between some gentlemen of the Committee and myself, there being no provision in the bill for a second election; there being no safeguards for such a popular election; the bill being incongruous as to that purpose, I suggested the striking out of this clause. It was done as the report shows. It having got there by accident, it was stricken out at my suggestion, as a matter of course. The principles upon which that measure was based, were these:—First, that all the legal voters of the Territory should have a fair opportunity, free from force or fraud, to elect a Convention, and to make a Constitution; AND THEN THAT THEY SHOULD COME INTO THE UNION, UNDER THAT CONSTITUTION, WITHOUT REFERRING EITHER THE CONSTITUTION TO THE PEOPLE, OR THE QUESTION OF ADMISSION AGAIN TO CONGRESS. It was intended as an assent to admission, in advance."—*Appendix to the Cong. Globe*, 1857-'58, *page* 127.

Best of all, however, is the testimony of Mr. Douglas, given in the Senate, on the 9th of December, 1857, as follows:

"During the last Congress I reported a bill from the Committee on Territories, to authorize the people of Kansas to assemble and form a Constitution for themselves. Subsequently the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Toombs) brought forward a substitute for my bill, which, AFTER HAVING BEEN MODIFIED BY HIM AND MYSELF IN CONSULTATION, was passed by the Senate."—*Cong. Globe, part* 1, 1857-58, *page* 15.

Bigler and Toombs having avowed their complicity in the swindle, Mr. Douglas thus makes haste to admit his share in it, by saying that it was modified "by himself and Toombs in consultation." What was the modification? Simply this: that Mr. Douglas reported the bill back, not only with the submission clause stricken out, but with a new clause inserted, which reads as follows:

"AND UNTIL THE COMPLETE EXECUTION OF THIS ACT, NO OTHER ELECTION SHALL BE HELD IN SAID TERRITORY."

Can any one fail to comprehend this clear and logical chain of evidence? At the time when Douglas and Toombs were at work on their precious conspiracy, Kansas was in the hands of the Border Ruffians and entirely at their mercy. The Territorial office-holders were nearly all assassins and outlaws. The Federal troops were either assisting or conniving at the Missouri invasion. Under these circumstances is there any doubt *what kind* of a Constitution would have been made by the Buford-Atchison gang who were then ravaging Kansas, when they understood perfectly that their act would be conclusive of the destinies of the Territory, and when Douglas had especially provided that "until the complete execution of the act, *no other election shall be held in the Territory!*"

HE DEFENDS THE BORDER RUFFIANS OF MISSOURI.

In his report of March 12th, 1856, already referred to, Mr Douglas defended the Border Ruffian invaders of Kansas, as follows:

"The natural consequence was, that immediate steps were taken by the people of the western counties of Missouri to stimulate, organize and carry into effect a system of emigration similar to that of the Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Company, for the avowed purpose of counteracting the effects and protecting themselves, and their domestic institutions from the consequences of that company's operations. The material difference in the character of the two rival and conflicting movements consists in the fact *that the one had its origin in an AGGRESSIVE and the other in a DEFENSIVE policy.*"

HE DECLARES THE BOGUS LEGISLATURE OF KANSAS TO HAVE BEEN VALID.

In the same report, and on page 15 thereof, Mr. Douglas asserted the validity of the bogus Legislature, and its acts, as follows:

"So far as the question involves THE LEGALITY OF THE KANSAS LEGISLATURE AND THE VALIDITY OF ITS ACTS, it is entirely immaterial whether we adopt the reasoning and conclusion of the minority or majority reports, for each proves that the LEGISLATURE WAS LEGALLY AND DULY CONSTITUTED."

HE SAYS THE PEOPLE OF KANSAS MUST BE "SUBDUED."

In the same report, and on page 40 thereof, he advocates the subjection of the people of Kansas, in the following words:

"In this connection, your Committee feel sincere satisfaction in commending the messages and proclamations of the President, in which we have the gratifying assurance that the supremacy of the laws will be maintained; that rebellion will be crushed; * * * that the federal and local laws will be vindicated against all attempts of organized resistance."

And again, in his speech of March 12th, 1856:

"The minority report advocates foreign interference; we advocate self-government and non-interference. We are ready to meet the issue, and there will be no dodging. We intend to meeet it boldly; TO REQUIRE SUBMISSION TO THE LAWS AND TO THE CONSTITUTED AUTHORITIES; TO REDUCE TO SUBJECTION THOSE WHO RESIST THEM, AND TO PUNISH REBELLION AND TREASON. I am glad that a defiant spirit is exhibited here; we accept the issue."—*Cong. Globe, part* 1, 1855-56, *page* 639.

HE THINKS SENATOR SUMNER SHOULD BE "KICKED LIKE A DOG."

On the 20th day of May, 1856, Mr. Douglas indulged in the following language, in reply to Senator Sumner—the day on which he was bludgeoned by Preston S. Brooks:

"It is his object to provoke some of us to KICK HIM AS WE WOULD A DOG! A hundred times has he called the Nebraska Bill a swindle—an act of infamy, and each time went on to illustrate the complicity of each man who voted for it in perpetrating the crime. * * * How dare he approach one of these gentlemen, to give him his hand, after that act? If he felt the courtesies between men, he would not do it. He would deserve to have himself SPIT IN THE FACE for doing so."—*Appendix to the Cong. Globe*, 1855-56, *page* 545.

HE VINDICATES DAVID R. ATCHISON.

In the same speech, and on the same day, Mr. Douglas proceeded to vindicate David R. Atchison, of Missouri, who was then leading a company of Border Ruffians against Kansas, in the following eulogistic terms:

"The Senator has also made an assault on the late President of the Senate—General Atchison—A GENTLEMAN OF AS KIND A NATURE, OF AS GENUINE AND TRUE A HEART AS EVER ANIMATED A HUMAN SOUL. He is impulsive and generous, carrying his GOOD QUALITIES sometimes to an excess, which induces him to say and do many things that would not meet my approval; but all who know him, know him to be A GENTLEMAN AND AN HONEST MAN—true and loyal to the Constitution of his country."—*Appendix to the Cong. Globe*, 1855-56, *page* 546.

HE THINKS SENATOR TRUMBULL IS A TRAITOR, AND THAT ALL TRAITORS SHOULD BE HUNG.

The following extract from Mr. Douglas' speech on Kansas affairs, in the Senate, March 20th, 1856, is submitted without comment. The language is sufficiently direct for the comprehension of all fair-minded men:

"A word or two more on another point and I will close. My colleague has made an assault on the President of the United States for his efforts to vindicate the supremacy of the laws, and put down insurrection and rebellion in the Territory of Kansas. In my opinion, the President of the United States is entitled to the thanks of the whole country for the promptness and energy with which he has met the crisis. It was his imperative duty to maintain the supremacy of the laws and see that they are faithfully executed It was his duty to suppress rebellion and put down treason. My colleague says that it will be necessary to catch the traitor before the President can hang him. My opinion is that, from the signs of the times, and in view of all that is passing around us, as well as at a distance, there will be very little difficulty in arresting the traitors—and that, too, WITHOUT GOING ALL THE WAY TO KANSAS TO FIND THEM! [Laughter.] This government has shown itself the most powerful of any on earth in all respects except one. It has shown itself equal to foreign war or to domestic defence; equal to any emergency that may arise in the exercise of its high function in all things EXCEPT THE POWER TO HANG A TRAITOR!

I trust in God that the time is not near at hand, and that it may never come, when it will be the imperative duty of those charged with the faithful execution of the laws, to exercise that power. I trust that calmer and wiser counsels will prevail; that passion may subside, and reason and loyalty return, before the overt act shall be committed. I fervently hope that the occasion may never arise which shall render it necessary to test the power of the Government and the firmness of the executive in this respect; but if, unfortunately, that contingency shall happen; if treason against the United States shall be consummated, far be it from my purpose to express the wish that the penalty of the law may not fall upon the traitor's head!"—*Appendix to the Cong. Globe*, 1855—56, *page* 288.

HE INDORSES THE LECOMPTON CONSTITUTION IN ADVANCE.

On the 12th of June, 1857, Mr. Douglas made his "Grand Jury" speech, so-called, at Springfield, to which one reference has already been made. The following extracts from this speech are taken from the phonographic report published in the Missouri *Republican* of June 18th, 1857. The famous Lecompton Convention had just been called by the bogus Legislature, and on this topic he spoke as follows:

"Kansas is about to speak for herself through her delegates assembled in convention to form a constitution, preparatory to her admission into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. Peace and prosperity now prevail throughout her borders. The law under which her delegates are to be elected is believed to be just and fair in all its objects and provisions. If any portion of the inhabitants, acting under the advice of political leaders in distant States, shall choose to absent themselves from the polls, and withhold their votes, with a view of leaving the Free State Democrats in a minority, and thus securing a pro-slavery constitution in opposition to a majority of the people living under it, let the responsibility rest on those who, for partisan purposes, will sacrifice the principles they profess to cherish and promote."

HE SAYS THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE WAS NOT INTENDED TO INCLUDE "ALL MEN."

In the same speech, Mr. Douglas ventilated his views of the Declaration of Independence, as follows:

"The signers of the Declaration of Independence, referred to the white man, and to him alone, when they declared that all men were created equal. They were in a struggle with Great Britain. The principle they were asserting was THAT A BRITISH SUBJECT BORN ON AMERICAN SOIL, WAS EQUAL TO A BRITISH SUBJECT BORN IN ENGLAND—that a British subject here, was entitled to all the rights, and privileges, and immunities, under the British Constitution, that a British subject in England enjoyed; that their rights were inalienable, and hence that Parliament, whose power was omnipotent, had no power to alienate them."

It appears thus, that in Mr. Douglas' opinion not only the African race, but the German, Italian, French, Scandinavian, and, indeed, every nation except the English, Irish, Scotch and American, are excluded from all part or lot in the Declaration of Independence. The phrase "all men," does not refer to them. They have no business with the Fourth of July. It is to be observed that in this matter Mr. Douglas has outrun the Dred Scott decision itself, which, after quoting the language of the Declaration of Independence, says:

"The general words above quoted would seem to embrace the whole human family, and if they were used

in a similar instrument at this day, would be so understood. But it is too clear for dispute, that the enslaved African race were not intended to be included, and formed no part of the people who framed and adopted this declaration."

HE SAYS SLAVERY IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RULES OF CIVILIZATION AND CHRISTIANITY.

In the same speech Mr. Douglas gave utterance to the following atrocious sentiments on slavery in the abstract:

"At that day the negro was looked upon as a being of an inferior race. All history had proved that in no part of the world or the world's history, had the negro ever shown himself capable of self-government, and it was not the intention of the founders of this government to violate that great law of God which made the distinction between the white and the black man. *That distinction is plain and palpable, and it has been the rule of civilization and christianity the world over, that whenever any man or set of men were incapable of taking care of themselves, they should consent to be governed by those who are capable of managing their affairs for them.*"

In revising the Missouri *Republican's* report of this speech, for publication in the *State Register*, Mr. Douglas or some discreet friend omitted this obnoxious paragraph. But that does not relieve him from the responsibility of it, because we find the same idea, in nearly the same language, in his Chicago speech of October 23d, 1850, as published in Sheahan's Life of Douglas, to wit:

"The civilized world have always held that when any race of men have shown themselves so degraded by ignorance, superstition, cruelty and barbarism as to be utterly incapable of governing themselves, they must, in the nature of things, be governed by others, by such laws as are deemed applicable to their condition."—*Sheahan's Life of Douglas, page* 184.

This is popular sovereignty with a vengeance!

HE DON'T CARE WHETHER SLAVERY IS VOTED DOWN OR VOTED UP.

It was with this epigrammatic phrase that Mr. Douglas signalized his objection to the Lecompton Constitution, on the 9th of December, 1857, when he spoke as follows:

"But I am told, on all sides, 'Oh, just wait: the pro-slavery clause will be voted down.' That does not obviate any of my objections: it does not diminish any of them. You have no more right to force a Free State Constitution on Kansas than a Slave State Constitution. If Kansas wants a Slave State Constitution, she has a right to it; if she wants a Free State Constitution, she has a right to it. It is none of my business which way the slavery clause is decided. I CARE NOT WHETHER IT IS VOTED DOWN OR VOTED UP."—*Cong. Globe*, 1857-58, *part* 1, *page* 18.

HE URGES THAT SLAVERY SHOULD LAST FOREVER.

In his joint debate with Mr. Lincoln, at Quincy, Illinois, Mr. Douglas frankly confessed that his "great principle" contemplated that slavery should last *forever*. He said:

"In this State, we have declared that a negro shall not be a citizen, and we have also declared that he shall not be a slave. We had a right to adopt that policy. *Missouri has just as good a right to adopt the other policy.* I am now speaking of rights under the Constitution, and not of moral or religious rights. I do not discuss the morals of the people of Missouri, but let them settle that matter for themselves. I hold that the people of the slaveholding States are civilized men as well as ourselves; that they bear consciences as well as we; and that they are accountable to God and their posterity, and not to us. It is for them to decide, therefore, the moral and religious right of the slavery question for themselves, within their own limits. I assert that they had as much right under the Constitution to adopt the system of policy which they have, as we had to adopt ours. So it is with every other State in this Union. Let each State stand firmly by that great constitutional right, let each State mind its own business and let its neighbors alone, and there will be no trouble on this question. If we will stand by that principle, then Mr. Lincoln will find that this Republic CAN EXIST FOREVER DIVIDED INTO FREE AND SLAVE STATES, as our fathers made it, and the people of each State have decided."—*Lincoln and Douglas Debates of* 1858, *page* 209.

HE SAYS IF HE WERE A CITIZEN OF LOUISIANA HE WOULD VOTE FOR THE PERPETUATION OF SLAVERY.

In his Sedition law speech, in the Senate, on the 23d of January, 1860, Mr. Douglas went a step further by asserting, roundly and without qualification, that if he were a resident of a Southern State, he would vote to retain and maintain slavery. His language was as follows:

"Sir, I hold the doctrine that a wise statesman will adapt his laws to the wants, conditions and interests of the people to be governed by them. SLAVERY MAY BE VERY ESSENTIAL IN ONE CLIMATE AND TOTALLY USELESS IN ANOTHER. IF I WERE A CITIZEN OF LOUISIANA, I WOULD VOTE FOR RETAINING AND MAINTAINING SLAVERY, BECAUSE I BELIEVE THE GOOD OF THAT PEOPLE WOULD REQUIRE IT."—*Cong. Globe*, 1859-60, *page* 559.

HE THINKS SLAVERY IS A MERE QUESTION OF DOLLARS AND CENTS.

Shortly after the Illinois election of 1858, Mr. Douglas made a Southern tour, stopping at St. Louis, Memphis, and New Orleans, and addressing the people at those places on political topics. He spoke at Memphis, on the 29th of November, and the following is an extract from his speech as reported phonographically in the Memphis *Avalanche:*

"Whenever a Territory has a climate, soil and productions making it the *interest* of the inhabitants to encourage slave property, they will pass a slave code and give it encouragement. Whenever the climate, soil and productions preclude the possibility of slavery being profitable, they will not permit it. YOU COME RIGHT BACK TO THE PRINCIPLE OF DOLLARS AND CENTS. I do not care where the immigration in the Southern country comes from: if old Joshua R. Giddings should raise a colony in Ohio and settle down in Louisiana, he would be the strongest advocate of slavery in the whole South; he would find, when he got there, his opinion of slavery would be very much modified; he would find, on those sugar plantations, that it was not a question between the white man and the negro, but between *the negro and the crocodile.* He would say, that, between the negro and the crocodile, he took the side of the negro; but, between the negro and the white man, he would go for the white man."

Again, in his speech of February 29, 1860, in the Senate, in the course of his assault on Senator Seward, he said:

"We in Illinois tried Slavery while we were a Territory, and found it was not profitable; and *hence* we turned philanthropists and abolished it."—*Cong. Globe*, 1859-60, *page* 915.

And again in the same discussion:

"But they (the people of Illinois) said, 'experience proves that it is not going to be profitable in this climate.' *They had no scruples about it.* Every one of them was nursed by it. His father and his mother held slaves. *They had no scruple about its being right*, but they said, 'we cannot make any money by it, and as our State runs away off north, up to those eternal snows, perhaps we shall gain population faster if we stop slavery and invite in the Northern population;'

and as a matter of political policy, State policy, they prohibited slavery themselves."—*Cong. Globe*, 1859-60, *page* 919.

HE SAYS THE ALMIGHTY HAS REQUIRED THE EXISTENCE OF SLAVERY!

In the Memphis speech, following immediately after the extract quoted above, from the *Avalanche*, comes the following blasphemous declaration:

"The Almighty has drawn the line on this continent ON ONE SIDE OF WHICH THE SOIL MUST BE CULTIVATED BY SLAVE LABOR. That line did not run on thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes, for thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes runs over mountains and through valleys. But this slave line meanders in the sugar fields and plantations of the South—[the remainder of the sentence was lost by the confusion around the reporter.] And the people living in the different localities and in the Territories must determine for themselves whether their 'middle bed' is best adapted for slave or free labor."

HE GOES FOR A SEDITION LAW.

On the 23d of January, 1860, Mr. Douglas made his famous speech in favor of a new Sedition Law, for the purpose of "suppressing the irrepressible conflict." Senator Mason had already introduced a resolution for the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate the John Brown raid at Harper's Ferry, and to report whether any further legislation was necessary in the premises. Nevertheless, Mr. Douglas introduced the following additional resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee of the Judiciary be instructed to report a bill for the protection of each State and Territory of the Union against invasion by the authorities or inhabitants of any other State or Territory; and for the suppression and punishment of conspiracies or combinations in any State or Territory with intent to invade, assail, or molest the government, inhabitants, *property*, or institutions of any other State or Territory of the Union."

Upon this resolution he made a speech, on the 23d of January, as aforesaid, from which the following are consecutive extracts:

"The question, then, is, what legislation is necessary and proper to render this guarantee of the Constitution effectual? I presume there will be very little difference of opinion that it will be necessary to place the whole military power of the Government at the disposal of the President, under proper guards and restrictions against abuse, to repel and suppress invasion when the hostile force shall be actually in the field. *But, sir, that is not sufficient.* Such legislation would not be a full compliance with this guarantee of the Constitution. The framers of that instrument meant more when they gave that guarantee. Mark the difference in language between the provision for protecting the United States against invasion and that for protecting the States. When it provided for protecting the United States, it said Congress shall have power to 'repel invasion.' When it came to make this guarantee to the States it changed the language and said the United States shall 'protect' each of the States against invasion.

"Then, sir, I hold that it is not only necessary to use the military power when the actual case of invasion shall occur, but to authorize the judicial department of the Government to suppress all conspiracies and combinations in the several States with intent to invade a State, or molest or disturb its government, its peace, its citizens, its *property*, or its institutions. You must punish the conspiracy, the combination *with intent to do the act*, and then you will suppress it in advance.

* * * * * * *

"It cannot be said that the time has not yet arrived for such legislation. It is only necessary to inquire into the causes which produced the Harper's Ferry outrage, and ascertain whether those causes are yet in active operation, and then you can determine whether there is any ground for apprehension that the invasion will be repeated. Without stopping to adduce evidence in detail, I have no hesitation in expressing my firm and deliberate conviction, that THE HARPER'S FERRY CRIME WAS THE NATURAL, LOGICAL, INEVITABLE RESULT OF THE DOCTRINES AND TEACHINGS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, AS EXPLAINED AND ENFORCED IN THEIR PLATFORM, THEIR PARTIZAN PRESSES, THEIR PAMPHLETS AND BOOKS, AND ESPECIALLY IN THE SPEECHES OF THEIR LEADERS IN AND OUT OF CONGRESS.

* * * * * * *

"And, sir, inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States confers upon Congress the power coupled with the duty of protecting each State against external aggression, and inasmuch as that includes the power of suppressing and punishing conspiracies in one State against the institutions, property, people, or government of every other State, *I desire to carry out the power vigorously.* Sir, give us a law as the Constitution contemplates and authorizes, and I will show the Senator from New York that there is a constitutional mode of repressing the 'irrepressible conflict.' *I will open the prison door to allow conspirators against the peace of the Republic and the domestic tranquillity of our States to select their cells wherein to drag out a miserable life, as a punishment for their crimes against the peace of society!!!*

"Can any man say to us that although this outrage has been perpetrated at Harper's Ferry, there is no danger of its recurrence? Sir, is not the Republican party still embodied, organized, confident of success, and defiant in its pretensions? Does it not now hold and proclaim the same creed that it did before the invasion? It is true that most of its representatives here disavow the *act* of John Brown at Harper's Ferry. I am glad that they do so; I am rejoiced that they have gone thus far: but I must be permitted to say to them that it is not sufficient that they disavow the act, unless they also repudiate and denounce the doctrines and teachings which produced the act. Those doctrines remain the same; those teachings are being poured into the minds of men throughout the country by means of speeches and pamphlets and books, and through partizan presses.

"Mr. President, the mode of preserving peace is plain. This system of sectional warfare must cease. The Constitution has given the power, and all we ask of Congress is to give the means, and we, BY INDICTMENT AND CONVICTIONS IN THE FEDERAL COURTS OF OUR SEVERAL STATES, WILL MAKE SUCH EXAMPLES OF THE LEADERS OF THESE CONSPIRATORS AS WILL STRIKE TERROR INTO THE HEARTS OF THE OTHERS, AND THERE WILL BE AN END OF THIS CRUSADE."—*Cong. Globe*, 1859-60, *pages* 552, 553.

The following is an extract from the old Sedition Law of 1798, which very nearly revolutionized the country—utterly ruined and destroyed the Federal party which took the responsibility of enacting it—and against which Thomas Jefferson and his friends fulminated the famous "Resolutions of '98," adopted by the Virginia and Kentucky Legislatures:

"*And be it further enacted*, That if any person shall write, print, utter or publish, or shall cause or procure to be written, uttered or published, or shall knowingly or willingly assist or aid in writing, printing, uttering or publishing any false, scandalous and malicious writing or writings, against the Government of the United States or either House of the Congress of the United States, or the President of the United States, with intent to defame the said Government, or either House of the Congress, or the said President, or to bring them, or either of them, into contempt or disrepute, or to excite against them, or either or any of them, the hatred of the good people of the United States, or to stir up sedition within the United States; or to excite any unlawful combinations therein, for opposing or resisting any law of the United States, or any act of the President of the United States, done in pursuance of any such law, or of the powers in him vested by the Constitution of the United States; then such person, being thereof convicted before any court of the United States having jurisdiction therein, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars, and by imprisonment not exceeding two years."

The difference between this Sedition Law and the one advocated by Mr. Douglas is, that the former sought to punish the expression of opinions against the constituted authorities of the United States, while the latter seeks to punish the expression of opinions against human slavery. Under Douglas' proposed law, Washington, Jef-

ferson, Franklin, Madison and nearly all the founders of the Republic, would be liable, if still living, to "indictments and convictions in our Federal courts."

THE UPSHOT OF JOHN BROWN'S INVASION OF VIRGINIA.

This is a proper place to inquire what state of facts existed, calling for Mr. Douglas' furious onslaught on the people of the North, and his malignant proposition to "open the prison doors and allow conspirators against the tranquillity of States to select cells wherein to drag out a miserable life." The Select Committee of the Senate, appointed to investigate the Harpers' Ferry affair, consisting of Messrs. Mason, Davis, Fitch, Collamer and Doolittle, commenced their labors on the 16th of December, 1859, and continued their sessions until the 14th of June, 1860. During this time they examined thirty-two witnesses from various parts of the country, and it is presumed they arrived at the facts of the case as nearly as it was possible to reach them. On the 15th of June, the majority of the Committee made a report, in which they say:

"The Committee, after much consideration, *are not prepared to suggest any legislation* which, in their opinion, would be adequate to prevent like occurrences in the future. The only provisions in the Constitution of the United States which would seem to import any authority in the Government of the United States to interfere on occasions affecting the peace or safety of the States, are found in the 8th section of the 1st article, amongst the powers of Congress, to provide for calling for militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; and in the 4th section of the 4th article in the following words: 'The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and on the application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence.' The 'invasion' here spoken of would seem to import an invasion by the public force of a foreign power, or (if not so limited and equally referable to an invasion of one State by another), still it would seem that public force, or force exercised under the sanction of acknowledged political power, is there meant. The invasion (to call it so) by Brown and his followers at Harper's Ferry, was in no sense of that character. IT WAS SIMPLY THE ACT OF LAWLESS RUFFIANS UNDER THE SANCTION OF NO PUBLIC OR POLITICAL POWER," etc.—*Report of Select Committee of the Senate on the Harper's Ferry affair*, *page* 18.

This report is signed, "J. M. Mason, *Chairman*, Jefferson Davis, G. N. Fitch." It ought to be good authority on the question whether any laws are required "to punish conspiracies and combinations *with intent* to do the act," as also on the other question whether the Republican party is responsible for John Brown's raid.

MR. DOUGLAS JUSTIFIES DISUNION.

In the Sedition Law speech, above referred to, Mr. Douglas went so far as to justify the crime of disunion unless Congress should enact the sort of law which he there proposed. As he is now charging disunion quite furiously against the Breckinridge faction, it is proper to show that less than one year ago he was encouraging the same thing himself. He said:

"If the people of this country shall settle down into the conviction that there is no power in the Federal Government to protect each and every State from violence, from aggression, from invasion, THEY WILL DEMAND THAT THE CORD BE SEVERED and the weapons be restored to their hands with which they may defend themselves. THIS INQUIRY INVOLVES THE QUESTION OF THE PERPETUITY OF THE UNION."—*Cong. Globe*, 1859-60, *page* 552.

JEFF. DAVIS REPUDIATES THE SEDITION LAW.

Two days after the Sedition law speech, Senator Davis took the floor and repudiated the whole thing as an alarming encroachment on the rights of the people. He said:

"I welcome, sir, the apprehensions of the President of the United States, and never would I enact a law which would clothe the executive with the power to call out the militia, to bring the army and navy TO INVADE A STATE TO DISCOVER WHO WITHIN THAT STATE HAD IN HIS BREAST THE PURPOSE AT SOME FUTURE DAY TO COMMIT CRIME. If there be unlawful, treasonable organizations within a State, it belongs to the State sovereignty to inquire and to punish the offender. * * * * * It is proper for me, Mr. President, to say that it is in no feeling of partizan warfare between me and the Senator and the President, if any such exist, that I have made the explanation. It is the deep interest I feel for the preservation of sound principles and the restriction of the Federal Government from striding over the sovereignties of the States to usurp such centralizing power, under the promptings of a momentary expediency, as would destroy the great charter of our liberty, and reduce the people to that condition from which they rose—THE SUBJECTS OF A GOVERNMENT NOT WITHIN THEIR CONTROL."—*Cong. Globe*, 1859-60; *pages* 589, 590.

MR. DOUGLAS TELLS WHAT "POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY" HAS DONE.

It will be admitted that Mr. Douglas is a good judge of what his dogma of "Popular Sovereignty" has accomplished during the past six years. Therefore, we let him tell the result in his own words, quoting from his speech in the Senate on the 16th of May, 1860, as printed in the Appendix to the *Congressional Globe:*

"But we are told that the necessary result of this doctrine of non-intervention, which gentlemen, by way of throwing ridicule upon, call squatter sovereignty, is to deprive the South of all participation in what they call the common territories of the United States. That was the ground on which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Davis] predicated his opposition to the compromise measures of 1850. He regarded a refusal to repeal the Mexican law as equivalent to the Wilmot Proviso; a refusal to recognize, by an act of Congress, the right to carry a slave there as equivalent to the Wilmot Proviso; a refusal to deny to a Territorial Legislature the right to exclude slavery as equivalent to an exclusion. He believed at that time that this doctrine did amount to a denial of Southern rights, and he told the people of Mississippi so; but they doubted it. Now, let us see how far his predictions and suppositions have been verified. I infer that he told the people so, for as he makes a charge in his bill of indictment against me, that I am hostile to Southern rights, because I gave those votes

"Now, what has been the result? My views were incorporated into the compromise measures of 1850, and his were rejected. Has the South been excluded from all the territory acquired from Mexico? What says the bill from the House of Representatives now on your table, repealing the slave-code in New Mexico established by the people themselves? It is part of the history of the country, that under the doctrine of non-intervention, this doctrine that you delight to call squatter sovereignty, the people of New Mexico have introduced and protected slavery in the whole of that Territory. UNDER THIS DOCTRINE THEY HAVE CONVERTED A TRACT OF FREE TERRITORY INTO SLAVE TERRITORY MORE THAN FIVE TIMES THE SIZE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK. UNDER THIS DOCTRINE, SLAVERY HAS BEEN EXTENDED FROM THE RIO GRANDE TO THE GULF OF CALIFORNIA, AND FROM THE LINE OF THE REPUBLIC OF MEXICO, NOT ONLY UP TO 36 deg. 30 min., BUT UP TO 38 deg., GIVING YOU A DEGREE AND A HALF MORE SLAVE TERRITORY THAN YOU EVER CLAIMED. In 1848 and 1849 and 1850, you only asked to have the line of 36 deg. 36 min. The Nashville Convention fixed that as its ultimatum. I offered it in the Senate, in August, 1848, and it was adopted here, but rejected in the House of Representatives. You asked only up to 36 deg. 30 min., AND NON-INTERVENTION HAS GIVEN YOU A SLAVE TERRITORY UP TO 38 deg.—A DEGREE AND A HALF MORE THAN YOU ASKED; and yet you say that this is a sacrifice of Southern rights!

"These are the fruits of this principle which the Senator from Mississippi regards as hostile to the rights of the South. Where did you ever get any other fruits that were more palatable to your taste or refreshing to your strength? What other inch of free territory has been converted into slave territory on the American continent, since the Revolution, except in New Mexico and Arizona, under the principle of non-intervention affirmed at Charleston. If it be true that this principle of non-intervention has conferred upon you all that immense territory; has protected slavery in that comparatively northern and cold region, where you did not expect it to go, cannot you trust the same principle further South, when you come to acquire additional territory from Mexico? If it be true that this principle of non-intervention has given to slavery all of New Mexico, which was surrounded on nearly every side by free territory, will not the same principle protect you in the northern States of Mexico, when they are acquired, since they are now surrounded by slave territory; are several hundred miles further south; have many degrees of greater heat; and have a climate and soil adapted to southern products? Are you not satisfied with these practical results?"—*Appendix to Cong. Globe*, 1859-60, *p.* 314.

HIS LAST FLING AT THE PEOPLE OF KANSAS.

The Hon. John Hickman, in his late speech in Concert Hall, Philadelphia, after a scathing review of Mr. Douglas' many crimes against freedom in Kansas, says; "It is gratifying, however, to make a single remark in his favor; it is this: that he seems as willing as the most ardent of his friends to divert attention from this period of his career. I am not aware that, in either essay or address, he has ventured to recur to it; but on the contrary, he seems disposed to treat as a blank in his life." Mr. Hickman has overlooked Mr. Douglas' speech in the Senate on the 29th of February last, when he repeated the most offensive and disreputable thing he ever said concerning the civil war in that Territory. It was this:

"Popular sovereignty in Kansas was stricken down by unholy combination in New England to ship men to Kansas—ROWDIES AND VAGABONDS—with the Bible in one hand and Sharpe's rifle in the other, TO SHOOT DOWN THE FRIENDS OF FREE INSTITUTIONS AND SELF-GOVERNMENT. Popular sovereignty in Kansas was stricken down by the combinations in the Northern States to carry elections under pretence of emigrant aid societies. In retaliation, Missouri formed aid societies, too; and she, following your example, sent men into Kansas, and then occurred the conflict. I condemn both, but I condemn A THOUSAND FOLD MORE those that set the example and struck the first blow than those who thought they would act on the principle of *fighting the devil with his own weapons*, and resorted to the same means that you have employed."—*Cong. Globe*, 1859-60 page 916.

PART III.—MISCELLANEOUS.

UNFRIENDLY LEGISLATION.

The doctrine of "unfriendly legislation" against the rights of property, as declared by the Dred Scott decision, was promulgated by Mr. Douglas in his debate with Mr. Lincoln, at Freeport, on the 23d of August, 1858, as follows:

The next question propounded to me by Mr. Lincoln is, can the people of a Territory in any lawful way, against the wishes of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a Constitution? I answer emphatically, as Mr. Lincoln has heard me answer a hundred times from every stump in Illinois, that in my opinion the people of a Territory can, by lawful means, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution. Mr. Lincoln knew that I had answered that question over and over again. He heard me argue the Nebraska bill on that principle all over the State in 1854, in 1855, and in 1856, and he has no excuse for pretending to be in doubt as to my position on that question. IT MATTERS NOT WHAT WAY THE SUPREME COURT MAY HEREAFTER DECIDE AS TO THE ABSTRACT QUESTION WHETHER IT MAY OR MAY NOT GO INTO A TERRITORY UNDER THE CONSTITUTION, THE PEOPLE HAVE THE LAWFUL MEANS TO INTRODUCE IT OR EXCLUDE IT AS THEY PLEASE, for the reason that slavery cannot exist a day or an hour anywhere, unless it is supported by police regulations. These police regulations can only be established by the local legislature, and if the people are opposed to slavery they will elect representatives in that body who will, by unfriendly legislation, effectually prevent the introduction of it into their midst. If, on the contrary, they are for it, their legislation will favor its extension. Hence, NO MATTER WHAT THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT MAY BE on that abstract question, still the right of the people to make a slave Territory or a free Territory, is perfect and complete under the Nebraska bill. I hope Mr. Lincoln deems my answer satisfactory on that point."—*Lincoln and Douglas Debates, page* 95.

Let the reader contrast these utterances with the Wickliffe resolution, adopted by the Douglas National Convention, and Mr. Douglas' letter of acceptance (page 10, *ante*).

HE THINKS "CONGRESS" MUST DETERMINE WHEN POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY SHALL BEGIN IN A TERRITORY.

In his copyright essay published in Harper's Magazine last year, Mr. Douglas substantially admits the Republican doctrine concerning the relation of Congress to the Territories, by saying:

"It [sovereignty] can only be exercised WHERE THERE ARE INHABITANTS SUFFICIENT TO CONSTITUTE A GOVERNMENT, AND CAPABLE OF PERFORMING ITS VARIOUS FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES—*A FACT TO BE ASCERTAINED AND DETERMINED BY CONGRESS.* WHETHER THE NUMBER SHALL BE FIXED AT TEN, FIFTEEN OR TWENTY THOUSAND INHABITANTS, DOES NOT AFFECT THE PRINCIPLE."

If the number may be fixed at ten, fifteen or twenty thousand inhabitants, it may of course be fixed at one hundred thousand or any other number sufficient to constitute a State.

MR. DOUGLAS' VIEWS OF NATIONAL PARTIES AND NATIONAL CREEDS.

Since Mr. Herschel V. Johnson has been hooted down by a mob in his own State, and since the creed of the Douglas party has been tabooed in at least one-third of the States of the Union, it will be interesting to all persons to learn the views of nationality entertained by Mr. Douglas himself; and it is difficult to find a broader joke with which to conclude this pleasing compilation. We close by quoting from his speech at Cincinnati, on the 9th of September, 1859, as reported in the New York *Times* of Sept. 12th:

"ANY POLITICAL CREED IS RADICALLY WRONG WHICH CANNOT BE PROCLAIMED IN THE SAME FORM WHEREVER THE AMERICAN FLAG WAVES, OR THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION RULES."

EVENING JOURNAL TRACTS, No. 18.

The Issues of the Day.

SPEECH

OF

WILLIAM M. EVARTS,

OF NEW YORK CITY,

AT

AUBURN, TUESDAY, OCT. 16, 1860.

Mr. Chairman and Fellow-Citizens—It is not with any expectation of saying or doing anything in the canvass for the party to which we are all attached and for the principles, the triumph of which we deem essential to the safety and true honor of our country, more than any other citizen who might be favored with your call to address you, that I now arise, and in the presence of this great multitude of sober and intelligent electors of the State of New York to say as briefly as may be what seems to be pertinent and important in the very stage of the canvass which we have now reached.

By the form of the Constitution one simple duty is now devolved upon the citizens of this country—that duty is the election of a President and Vice President. That is the extent and limit of our duty; and yet a large part of our citizens seem to be engaged in anything but that. They seem to suppose that the question which was before the Convention of 1787, and which resulted in the formation of the Constitution under which we now live, is ever open to this people, and that is "What Government they shall have, and whether they shall obey it?" Gentlemen, that question was settled for us, and it will remain settled long after we have passed from this stage.

THE NOMINATING CONVENTION.

Now, in preparation for the actual and practical duties imposed by the Constitution, I need not say to you, that if the Constitution is to be maintained and upheld, it is to be by the performance faithfully and intelligently of the duties that are assigned to us under it, and their performance at the time and in the manner that the Constitution itself proposes; and I say that in the preparation for the performance of that duty, various political parties have proposed for the suffrages of the citizens different candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States. One Convention was held by the party to which you, for the most part, I take it, and I belong—the Republican party of the United States of America. In a Convention in which twenty-four States of Union were represented, some partially, but still with twenty-four States, the Republican sentiment was fairly and honestly represented. They put in nomination for the suffrages of the people of the United States, dwelling wherever they may—in Maine, in Louisiana, in Georgia, in Michigan, in Oregon, or in California—Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, and Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine. [Applause] They are before the whole people, and there is nothing in the organization of the party, nothing in the principles that we propose, nothing in the character or purpose, the political conduct or history of our candidates, that should not as readily, as properly, as fairly invite a suffrage from the banks of the Arkansas, from the banks of the Columbia, as from the banks of the Penobscot or the North River. [Applause.]

Another political party representing in Convention twenty-five States, many of them fragmentary, many of them with disputed, and some of them, it seems to me, with sham representatives, but yet counting twenty-five States in some form or other, has also put forth candidates before the people. These are Judge Douglas, of

Illinois, and Gov. Johnson, of Georgia. They, too, are thrown before the people, whose suffrages are asked in their support.

Another Convention, representing in a somewhat irregular form, but yet containing representatives of twenty different States of the Union, has placed in nomination two other citizens of great distinction in the past political history of this country. They are Gov. Bell, of Tennessee, and Edward Everett, of Massachusetts; and they, with what antecedents, what principles they possess, with what they have done, whatever they have promised, are before the whole people for its choice.

Another Convention, representing in some way or another by sham, substitute, fragmentary, or nominal delegation in respect of some, yet representing nineteen States of the Union, have put in nomination Mr. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, and Gen. Lane, of Oregon, who are also before the people for their suffrages. And now the single question is, "Out of these candidates whom will ye choose to govern, under the Constitution, the people of all the States for the next four years?"

Now it strikes us, at first, as something quite different from the ordinary posture of a canvass for the Presidency, that there are so many tickets in the field, and as quite singular in the history of all parties that in not one of these Conventions was there a representation of the whole 33 States of the Union. In our own Convention, as I have stated, there were 24; in the Douglas Convention, made up as it was, there were but 25; in the Bell and Everett Convention, there but 20; and in the Breckenridge and Lane Convention there were but 19. This, gentlemen, teaches us upon distinct lines of fact, that are not to be disputed, that the sentiments of these people are divided in no inconsiderable degree upon subjects that are or were supposed to be connected with or involved in this canvass; for the failure of regular antagonism between candidates, and of a fair and full collection of all the States of the Union, is an indubitable fact.

WHAT THE REPUBLICANS INTEND DOING

Now, gentlemen, there is one party which proposes to fulfil its constitutional duty and to confine itself to its constitutional duty—to proceed without disorder and without confusion, without disturbance of the public peace or threats of the public safety to the election of the candidates that have been proposed for their suffrage. That party, I need not say to you, is the Republican party; but I must say to you that so far as I can discover, all the other parties in this canvass are determieed that they will not perform that constitutional duty in reference to their candidates, and are determined that we shall not perform it for ours. I state to you as the distinctive feature of this Presidential canvass, that, whereas, the duty is that a President shall be elected, and whereas, we propose to perform that duty, all the politics, all the zeal, all the oratory, all the enthusiasm, all the promises, all the threats, all the hopes are that we should be prevented from choosing our candidates; and that, so far as we can see, none of them propose to or expect to choose their own. Now, it is a little hard, gentlemen, that a party which quietly, soberly and faithfully sets about doing that which, unperformed, strikes at the very foundations of a Constitutional Government—to perform that duty which, failing to be performed, leaves our Government until the defect be supplied, without a chief magistrate upon whom depends the entire executive course of the Government—that a party such as ours, and so situated, I say it strikes me as hard that it should be stigmatized in all quarters as an enemy of the Constitution and the Union. It seems very odd to me that all these other parties that propose to defeat the whole canvass and prevent the people from coming to a choice, should, on their various platforms on various pretences, claim for themselves the conduct and character of faithful servants of the Constitution and protectors of the Union against us, the Republicans.

THE QUESTION OF CONSTITUTIONALITY.

Now, gentlemen, mark how the matter stands Upon what do they justify themselves in this course? That we are dangerous to the Government, and that our success threatens the Union and the Constitution! What should be the way in which our opponents should act when a candidate is put in nomination whose success threatens the dangers which they allege? What is the way to defeat him? Manifestly by putting in nomination against him a candidate whose character and whose principles will maintain the Union and uphold the Constitution. [Applause.] This is their duty. That is the theory of our Government—this is the plan for upholding it. Now, can they make the sensible portion of the United States believe that they dread the success of the Republican Party upon public grounds, and because of fear for the safety of the country, and they have not the patriotism, self-denial and largeness of views, to sacrifice personal interest and party success sufficiently to agree upon a man who can defeat the candidate of the Republican Party? Why, if they could show us that by defeating our candidate before the people, they could at the next stage of a Constitutional election in the House of Representatives be able then to agree upon a candidate, and thus avert these dangers to the Constitution and the Union, we might put more faith and have more patience with these, their views. But when they get to the House of Representatives, what they propose there is *not* to elect a President of the United States, which is the Constitutional duty there to be performed, but to prevent the Republicans, who there are the largest power in the suffrages of the States, from electing their candidates; and thus the Constitution is to be again defeated, a duty avoided; and the truth is, gentlemen, that they propose to carry on this entire controversy for these great offices against the Constitution, against the Union, and so far as their action goes, their success will be in the fact that for first time in the history of the country no President of the United States will have been elected anywhere. [Applause.]

Now, this is literally true. The whole scheme and plan is absolutely to defeat both plans of the Constitution for the election of a President, and then in the Senate where no President ever can be, or ever was intended to be, or ever by the Constitution was proposed to be elected, they shall elect a Vice-President, turn him into a President by operation of the law. [Applause.] Gentlemen, which of these opposing forces (for

there are three parties on one side and one on the other) understands the Constitution and their duty, and which of them proposes to fulfill it?

THE GREAT ISSUES INVOLVED.

Now, in every canvass for the Presidency while the suffrage remains free, and no power overawes the exercise of it on the part of the citizen, there must be involved to secure the attention of our vast population, and to attract their confidence and their votes to the one side or the other, some great sentiment, or some great interest that shall be disseminated, spread and enforced upon the popular mind to divide the country, and so by the major voices to carry into power one or the other of the parties espousing one or the other of these sentiments. This sentiment to be available for the purposes of a Presidential canvass, must be something that is vital to the Constitutional Government under which we live, and as extensive as the people whose suffrages are to determine the question. No local matters have a proper place in the Presidential canvass—no State interests force themselves upon the attention of the people so as to disturb or be of any use in the canvass for the Presidency. We inherit the idea from our British ancestry, that with every general election for Parliament, whatever the purposes of the party may be, they must go to the country upon some vital interest of the British Constitution.

Now, these are two great sentiments to which the hearts of the people always have responded—to which they will respond in this canvass—to which, I trust, they will always respond while we are a nation, and neither our prophetic nor our imaginative vision carries us beyond that time. They are the two great sentiments of liberty, to which we owe our birth as a nation, which shines in every line of the Declaration of Independence, the great statute of our national existence. The love of liberty pervades the people, and, touched by that chord, it throws on the one side or the other of it the opposing parties, and who rallies in the loudest and clearest tones for liberty, will be likely to carry the day. But there is another sentiment which, as well as this one I have named, forms the spirit of the people; there is another sentiment which is called home in this pressure upon the consciences, the feelings and the intelligence of the people, and that is what relates to the actual body politic, the national life, the Constitution of our liberties in the form and frame of the American Union. That is a sentiment which never can be, and never shall be disparaged in any canvass with which you or I, or any Republican, has aught to do. For, if liberty be the inspiring spirit of our national life, the Union is the bodily frame of that life itself, and without it we have no country. It matters but little to us whether our free, happy, powerful and prosperous national life, suffers its death-blow from a wound inflicted upon liberty, or from a wound inflicted upon the national frame of the Gouernment. Poland, dismembered, equally with France, imperialized, has lost its national life. While we contend for the one sentiment with greater ardor, as it seems exposed, let us never doubt,—let us never fail to admit, that with a nation which comes to its end when its frame is destroyed, whether the soul of liberty be separated from the body of its Constitution, or the body of its Constitution be dissevered and dismembered, so that liberty can no longer inspire and more it, national death and destruction are equally the result. Accordingly we shall find, gentlemen, that in these great agitations of an intelligent and free people, which form the working forces of a Presidential canvass, one or the other of these great sentiments is sought to be availed of for party success; I do not say dishonestly,—sometimes honestly, sometimes otherwise, for sometimes there is an enormous gap in the process of reasoning which suggests that certain principles will be promoted by the election of a certain candidate. When you see in a little petty town election, over a petty poll booth, that widespread premise and this mean conclusion; that "all the friends of the Union and the Constitution will vote for John Smith for Constable," you sometimes conclude that there is, possibly, a gap which may excuse a friend of the Constitution and the Union from voting for Smith. [Laughter.] But, nevertheless, some connection is to be preserved, and you must judge, and the people do judge, whether in the watchword and promises of a party, there is a fair and reasonable association with the success of the candidates. Look at the various parties that are before the people. I will state with candor, and certainly with no intention to impute wrong sentiments, my views of the various parties, and I do say that we find arrayed in those mottoes and watchwords, sentiments which define and fairly represent the objects and purposes, the moving and controlling feelings that actuate the parties now before the people.

THE TRUE ABOLITION PARTY.

There is a small party which I have not yet named, and which has its candidate before the people—a party which seems wholly devoted to the inspiration of the single idea of liberty, and which seems to me to have failed in a true, courageous comprehension of the duty of American citizens in this behalf. I am sure I don't know precisely by what name this party is called now; sometimes it has been called the "Liberty;" by its opponents it has generally been called the "Abolition Party, and sometimes the "pure Anti-Slavery Party." Gerrit Smith, I believe, is its candidate for the Presidency. Now I am inclined to think that, so absorbing, so controlling, has this party regarded the sentiment of Liberty as running through even the abject class of our population, in certain States of our Union, they really do give it predominance and preëminence over the sentiment of Union; and that, if they could have their own way, and had to choose whether they would carry on to its final triumphant success, this principle of Liberty at the sacrifice of the Union itself, they would be obliged fairly to say that Liberty or Disunion was the feeling and hope of their hearts. I don't criticise the sentiment. It is an honest, manly and brave sentiment, and whenever honest, manly and brave sentiments are avowed and enforced before this people by the fair arts of public influence, I have not a word to say against them, nor a frown to give to their supporters. I think, however, that the members of this party fail of their duty. They do not, perhaps, love liberty too much, but they do not appreciate the fact that the Union is at the

bottom of liberty, all that we have or may have, and that that liberty which cannot be promoted in the Union cannot be promoted out of it. [Applause.]

THE SOUTHERN DISUNION PARTY

There is another party which, I am bound to say, has given so unfortunate, and, as it seems to me, so monstrous a perversion to the sentiment of liberty, that it is willing to adopt, and really does feel the sentiments expressed by the motto or watchword: "Slavery or Disunion." This party has for its candidates Breckenridge and Lane. Now, gentlemen, here is a party that discards and tramples on these two sacred sentiments alike. So absorbed is it in the special interests of property—or let them call it what they choose, I have selected their own nomenclature,—that they will advance it before and beyond either of the sentiments, "Liberty" or "The Union of the States." And they give us the proposition, I think, by their orators, by their political courses, by their platforms, and by their conduct generally, to understand that they now give in their adhesion to the interests of Slavery so far, so vehemently, and so exclusively, that if in their plans, their hopes and their sentiments be not adopted by ths American people, and confirmed by the suffrages of the voters of the country, thus failing of Slavery's prosperity and advancement, they will take disunion and its consequences.

THE DOUGLAS PARTY.

Now, there is the Douglas Party at the south and the north, which gives such a predominance to the sentiment of Union, and yet adhering to this great interest of Slavery which is in our politics. It may be said that they shape their formula in this wise: Slavery and Union; that is to say, not that they prefer Slavery, but that the Union is a sentiment so strong and Slavery an interest so strong, that they have not the courage, the faith, the reliance upon free principles sufficient to lead them to adopt more devotion even to the Union, and that Union and Slavery be voted up or down—to live and thrive, or dwindle nnd decay—as may be, in their contrivance for the safety of the country.

THE BELL AND EVERETT PARTY.

There is a party which is represented by the respectable candidates—Messrs. Bell and Everett—which, at least in the Free States, does not seem to put itself upon the same footing in these regards as the Douglas Party; though, so far as I can discover, the same political organization in the Slave States seems to have about the same sentiment of Slavery and Union, without Slavery or Disunion, and yet not coming to any higher standard than Slavery and Union. This party in the Free States, represented by Messrs. Bell and Everett, so far as I can see, is so absorbed and so subjugated to this sentiment of Union—a wise and patriotic sentiment certainly, when not pushed to extravagance—that it is willing to put itself upon a footing of political servility to the institution of Slavery. Will it adopt, will it vindicate, will it espouse, as its choice and preference, for the sake of Union and what it deems peace, harmony and quiet, political servility, and surrender those free and spontaneous sentiments which all free men feel on this subject? But "political servility and Union" are what they are willing, in substance and effect, to present for the good of the country, and it is the best which they, at this juncture, can do.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

Now, gentlemen, the Republican Party, in my judgment, is ready to take hold with confidence, with firmness, with energy and with faith in the people and the principles of our fathers, of the two great sentiments, that divide sometimes, but really should always unite the parties of the American people, and to inscribe as the legends of its banners in this controversy, "Liberty and Union now and forever, one and inseparable." [Applause.] Do we flatter ourselves or disparage our opponents in this distribution and division of these great sentiments that are our common birthright? I know that Republicans are for liberty and for the Union; I know that they ask no greater liberty and no greater power for themselves in the regions of our country where they live than they are willing to accord to their fellow men in every portion of our fair land. [Applause.] I know that it is a prevalent, fervent and predominant sentiment of the Republican heart, that when we get outside of that natural feeling which we give to our birth-place, when we get outside of that allegiance which we owe to that political community known as the State in whlch we were born and in which we live—outside of that circumscription which nature and political duty draw closely around us. I know that there is not a Republican within the sound of my voice that does not rejoice in, and hope for, and plan for, and work for, under these life-giving sentiments of "Liberty and Union," the good of Alabama and Louisiana as much as for the good of Vermont or Michigan. [Applause.]

Our sentiments are not sectional. The life that we draw from them will be communicated to every portion of our land, wherever those portions of our land are ready to imbibe their life-giving influence. And we will disseminate them; we will upbold them; we will maintaln the conflict in favor and for the good of all parts of the country.

THE "ONE IDEA" CHARGE.

It is said, gentlemen, that the Republican Party, if represented rightly by this sentiment of liberty, and this love of Union, is a "one-idea party. There is but one duty confided to us in this canvass, and that is the election of a President and Vice-President, and that duty performed, we shall have performed our obligation to the Constitution of the United States. But let us see whether we are a "one-idea" party, and whether it is a reproach. If it be founded on an idea, it is an idea large enough, when divided up, to furnish the antagonistic principles of three other parties. [Laughter.] That is something in size and bulk for an idea. Is it then to be objected to that it has not an idea that is in the people's heads and hearts? Gentlemen, who make parties, platforms, and combinations, and who furnish sentiments? One would suppose that they were made to order by some superior power, and were let down upon the people to be adopted under the direction of leading politicians. The people have the ideas

and the sentiments, out of which moral forces and politics are directed and controlled. [Applause.] And when a party on one side, or on the other, has the ideas and the sentiments that the people have in their heads and hearts, it has enough for that canvass. Some of our respectable friends, who don't like agitation, are constantly asking us, "Why will you divide the people on the question of Slavery? Why don't you divide them upon something that they all agree about?" [Laughter.]

This is all childish nonsense, and he who thinks that he can by whistling raise the wind to carry his craft across the Atlantic, will think that in political juntas you can agree to suppress a sentiment or an idea, and get up some other for popular use. So much for that. But the idea is a large one, and it is connected inseparably with these two sentiments of our love of country and our love of liberty, and, therefore, the purposes and principles of the Republican Party do rightly invoke these united sentiments. The idea, gentlemen, is that Slavery whether it be good or bad, politic or pernicious, is local, and that free labor is the national basis upon which we build up wealth and power. [Loud applause.] Now that is the idea, and it is an idea large enough for any nation to have for a four years' canvass. [Applause.]

SLAVERY LOCAL AND NOT NATIONAL.

Let us see how this question arose—how much of fact, and fact that cannot be disfigured or kept out of view, there is in it, and about which all must agree. The great fact is, gentlemen, that the population of our country includes within its bosom four millions of persons of African descent. There is the fact. No Southern statesman or politician can disguise it; no Northern statesman can influence or pervert it. Here they are. What have we to do about them? I mean "we" as a nation—you and I in our political duties, not in our philanthropy, with our sympathies or our moral and religious influences; but what have we to do with the fact politically, in our duty as citizens under the Federal Constitution? That is the question that divides the country.

In the first place, gentlemen, these blacks are for the most part in the condition of Slavery. They have derived that condition, and it is maintained over them by the force of the laws of the separate States in which they live. I need not say to you, gentlemen, that we should have no confusion of ideas about what Liberty and Slavery are. They have nothing magical about them. The difference between them, wide and deep as it may be, exists wholly by positive law. Why are we free? Why do we call ourselves free? What do we mean by freedom, except that we live in communities whole laws leave us free, as God made us, deducting only that small contribution from individual liberty which is necessary for the common right and the common safety? It is in our laws,—in our magistrates who protect those laws,—in the processes of those laws which which give to the feeblest the support of the whole community in defence of his rights,—that we are freemen. Sir James McIntosh, than whom there never was a clearer thinker in these matters, defines liberty as a "security against wrong." That is liberty. Think it over as to what is your condition of liberty. It is security against wrong. You are permitted to work out your sentiments and the purposes of your nature, as an individual, against wrong and oppression. Now, Slavery—Slavery is a word that trips lightly on the tongue, but Slavery is nothing but the local condition in which the Slaves are, by power of the Government under which they live and which controls them;—and perhaps as ready and complete a definition of Slavery as has yet been given would be the converse of the definition of Liberty. Slavery, gentlemen, in essence, in practical abjectness and misery, is helplessness against wrong, [applause] and that is the legal condition in which it is placed in the communities where it is cherished and maintained as a social institution. I need not say to you that, as a political duty, we have nothing to do with the passing of the laws in States where Slavery exists—and that ends that subject. Where, then, does the conflict srise which causes this diversity of sentimett and this conflict of political action? Why, when this black population is to overflow the bounds of these separate independent States, by the laws of which its condition is fixed, then it becomes a question for those into whose territories it flows to say what shall be done with it; and if it overflows into the territories of the United States of America, then you and I and every citizen has a political responsibility and a political duty, because then it is beyond State jurisdiction, and is within the jurisdiction of the United States of America. And as it is a condition that it must have the support of the law to exist in fact, it must be governed and regulated by the laws of the Government having jurisdiction—even the Territories into which it overflows. Thus, you and I, in common with the citizens of Alabama and Missouri, of Massachusetts and Illinois, have our say, our opinions, our votes, our action and our principles upon the subject. Now, can any one gainsay this? Gentlemen, as I have said, the idea being that Slavery is local, and not national, the moment you remove, or attempt to remove this African population out of the States in which they are held in bondage, into your Territories, under your Government, under your laws, whether that population shall be held in Slavery,—kept in the condition of helplessness against wrong, or whether that population comes in the Territory to be lifted into freedom and protected by security against wrong, is precisely the duty and the action that you must meet, whatever the consequences, under your duty to the Constitution and in maintenance of your share of the citizens' protection and defence of the Government.

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT.

Now this conflict has been said to be irrepressible, and various authors of this doctrine of the irrepressibility between the interests of slave labor and of free labor have been brought before the notice of the people. Gov. Seward was reproached with having in 1858 invented this doctrine of an "irrepressible conflict." Since that time Mr. Lincoln has been put forward as the candidate of the Republican Party, and so that reproach, if it be a reproach, as our opponents intended it, has been transferred to Mr. Lincoln, and they say that he, two years earlier than Gov. Seward, was the author of that doctrine.

Well, gentlemen, I happen to have a little ex-

tract from a newspaper which will show you another origin for this doctrine of the "irrepressible conflict" between the forces of slave and free society. The Richmond Enquirer, before Seward and before Lincoln, set down this proposition —

"The opposite and conflicting forms of society cannot, among civilized men, coexist and endure. The one must give way and cease to exist - the other become universal If free society be unnatural, immoral and unchristian, it must fall and give way to slave society—a social system as old as the world, as universal as man." [Laughter.]

And we take that issue. If free society is "unnatural, immoral and unchristian," which the Virginia editor says it is, then by the highest duty to ourselves and to all men, we must be turned into slaves. There certainly is an "irrepressible conflict" stated.

Well, gentlemen, these may be called the *observers* of this "irrepressible conflict" between the forces of slave labor and free labor—between societies respectively built upon these two opposite systems; the *author* of that conflict is He who mysteriously framed this union of the body and the soul which constitutes the human race. [Applause.] For in the last analysis the difference between slave labor and free labor is this, that a power superior to the individual man seizes upon him, degrades his labor, stimulates, enforces, and employs all his energies which allies him with the brute, his muscles, his nerves, his power as of oxen and of horses, in the labor that the slave owner gets by tasks from his abject dependants. Free labor is informed by man and directed by will. It is the application of the whole man by himself—the master of his own limbs by the intellect, the passions with which God has given him to rule his own body. And it is quite obvious that so long as there be these two methods, by one of which man is degraded to the level of the brute, and his labor to the level of brute labor, and by the other he is the master of his own body, and is lifted up by his own effort into moral, intellectual and social development and improvement, they "cannot, (as the editor of the Richmond Enquirer says,) among civilized men, coexist and endure" [Applause.] Let us see why.

Let us see what are some of the trivial objections which are made sometimes by honest-minded men. "What is the objection," they say, "that you free people of the North have to going into a Territory and running the forces of free society parallel with the system of slave labor?" Why, the moral conflict between them is utterly incompatible with the peaceful coexistence of the two together. I mean while they run on as forces conflicting and striving for the mastery, for I admit that the actual condition of the slaves, when it is settled that the institution is to pass away, may temporarily be left subordinate to and be controlled by the great forces of free society. Why, gentlemen, just take the two systems of the chaste Christian single marriage and that of polygamy—the system of one society which treats woman as an equal—the sharer of the heart of her husband, the mother or his children and the part of his household—and the system of polygamy, that treats her as the slave of his passions and makes her subject to his caprices; and then ask the free people of the North and the free people of the South (for in this question there is no difference of opinion between the two sections) what objection there is to polygamy occupying a Territory, and why they cannot go and live side by side with this institution. Gentlemen, nature is stronger than politicians. [Applause.] She will have her own way. Now, practically, is not this so? How happens it that the overflowing population of the sterile soil and inclement climate of New England States, and of this and other Northern States, have in the earlier days, when the impenetrable West imposed such barriers to the progress of civilization—how happens it, I ask, that that movement did not turn down into Virginia, the Carolinas, Alabama and Georgia? The laws of our country extended over the whole; the genial climate and fertile and prolific soil invited the industry of the free. Why did they not go there? Why did they shoot clear across the continent, as if there had been a wall of fire drawn on the northern boundary of Virginia? And why, not until they had occupied to the Pacific Ocean, did the returning wave seek to encroach upon the line of Territory that Slavery had claimed for its own?

Now, gentlemen, you see that this is not a fictitious issue. It is a real issue. It is deep, permanent, as necessary as the principles of human nature. You see that besides being a question of political duty and political right, in which we are concerned, it is a question whether our Territories shall be cultivated by free or by slave labor; it is a question of vital importance to the overflowing tide of our own population, because the presence of Slavery, as an established and controlling institution, necessarily drives the free population away from the reach of it.

THE CHARGES AGAINST THE REPUBLICANS.

And, gentlemen, it happens to be a little odd, with these sentiments, that the most extraordinary charges are made upon the Republican Party. Our fellow-citizens of the Slave States tell us, in justification of the system of Slavery, that it is the only system compatible with the co-existence of the same race in the same community—that is, their co-existence in at all equal numbers. That may be. We do not dispute with them upon that point. But we say, that being admitted, they cannot extend themselves into the Territories of the United States, and carry with them their black population, without having Slavery maintained and protected. Well, our principles are opposed to the maintainance and protection of Slavery in the Territories. That we avow; that they complain of; but that they understand. Yet you will find in the organs of opinion in the Southern States, and in their organs having affinity with them in the Free States, they charge that the Republican Party is in favor of Africanizing America. The policy and principles of the Republican Party to keep slaves out of the Territories, in the opinion of our Southern friends, is to keep the African race out of the Territories, while their principles would carry it in. And yet they say, and while they charge it in effect as a fault of ours, that our principles would fill the Territories with white people and would keep the slaves out, that we are in favor of Africanizing the Continent. The extension of the institution and of the population would be promoted and advanced by the policy and principles of the parties which are opposed to us, and we who stop the tide cannot be accused of fa-

voring the extension of that population. [Applause.]

THE QUESTION OF SLAVE INCREASE.

And here, gentlemen, I may notice a proposition which has been used by many persons to soothe their own consciences for their indifference on the subject of Slavery, and that is, that the carrying of the institution of Slavery into new Territories does not increase the number of Slaves. They are opposed to increasing the number of slaves, but they say that the extension of the institution does not increase the number of slaves. [Laughter.] A very respectable, intelligent gentleman, whom I ever desire to mention with honor, Mr. James T. Brady, the candidate of one of the divisions of the Democratic Party for Governor of this State, in a public speech that he recently delivered suggested that idea. Why, gentlemen, what can be more abhorrent to the plainest principles of social economy than that the extension of the area over which a race is distributed does not tend to their increase. Whenever Mr. Brady will be of the opinion that the descendants of Irishmen are no more in the world than they would have been if they had always been confined within the limits of Ireland; whenever we shall feel that there are no more descendants of Englishmen than if this wide Continent had not been opened to that population, but they had all been confined within the island of Great Britain; whenever it shall be true that there are just as many Morgan horses in the world as if they had always been confined to farm-work in Vermont, and had not been distributed over the country for the luxury of its population everywhere; whenever it shall be demonstrated that there would be just as many perch in the world if they had always been shut up in Owasco lake, and not distributed in rivers and lakes everywhere, then I say there will be something in the idea that the extension of Slavery into Territories does not tend to increase the number of slaves. [Applause.]

NEGRO EQUALITY.

And now, gentlemen, there is another question which I desire to meet fairly and squarely, and that is the imputation against the Republicrn Party as favoring negro equality. I take it that the Republican Party, and that every man whose mind and nature has been developed by education and Christianity, feels that because of the actual condition of feebleness, of ignorance and of degradation of anybody, he never gains any right, even by the weight of his little finger, to add to that depression and misfortune. [Applause.] And I take it that it will be a long time before it will be a mark of nobility of spirit and manliness of character to add to the misfortunes and feebleness of the humble and distressed. [Renewed applause.] I believe that it is a fundamental principle of civilized society and the Christian religion, that as before the eye of God, so in the judgment of the law, all men who are men are to have equal rights of protection. Now, when I am making this suggestion about the Republican Party's notion of the equality of negroes, God forbid that any man should say that I, professing, as I do, to speak with deliberation, with circumspection, with a just regard of duty to myself and to you, should ever be quoted as opposed to that kind of equality to the lowest and feeblest of the human race. But let us look a little at this subject of negro equality from points of view which do not occur to our Southern friends. They do not complain that the law which excluded Slavery or slaves from the Territory would prevent white men from going there, except in a particular relation, to which I shall advert. So far, then, as whites are concerned, the white man who chooses to go alone from South Carolina, or from Alabama, or from Kentucky, would have just as good a chance under this principle of exclusion of slaves, as a man from Vermont, from Pennsylvania, or from Ohio. But they say we white men of the South cannot go into a new Territory without our blacks carrying us. [Laughter.] And there is the difficulty. Now, which is the master of the situation and of the future of that man—the white man or the black man who must carry him? [Laughter.] You remember how Benjamin Franklin aided the diffusion of universal suffrage, when there was a property qualification which he wished to abolish, by a suggestion he made in regard to the property voting rather than the man. He says, "You require a man to possess $50 worth of property before he can vote." Now, to-day, a man professes himself to exercise the right of suffrage. He is asked whether he has $50 worth of property. He says, "Yes—I have a jackass that is worth $50." He votes. Well, at the next election the man comes up again, but his jackass having died he cannot vote. "Now," as Dr. Franklin, "which was it that voted the year before, the man or the jackass?" [Loud laughter.]

THE RELATIONS OF MASTER AND SLAVE.

Now, gentlemen, pursuing the tenor of these suggestions, if in the Southern States they have a class of the population in subjection to whom the movement of the white people must be made, it is very easy to see that in certain most important relations this population is the master of the movements of the whites. [Applause.]

But again, they say, that in their estimation a mixed population of whites and slaves, as a unit, is a better population than an equal number of people on one side of the line, all white. Well, gentlemen, let us suppose there are 1,000 white people forming a little community in the State of Ohio, and that on the opposite bank of the river, in Kentucky, there is another community made up of 500 whites and 500 negroes; and this latter community, they say, is stronger, wiser, safer, and better community than the 1,000 on our side. Well, gentlemen, when some British officers were trying to excuse the defeat of one of their frigates by an American frigate having a smaller crew, the Englishman retorted by saying that two-thirds of the crew of the American ship were Englishmen and Irishmen. "Yes," said the American, "and it was with just the other third that made the difference." [Laughter.] Now, take from the one community, of 1 000 white men, 500 white men, and you have 500 white men remaining But of the other community of 500 whites and 500 blacks, you take the 500 whites and you have 500 blacks remaining. It is that dilution of the black population that they consider a larger and better element of society than an equal number of white people on one side. [Laughter.] That is not only negro equality but negro superiority. [Applause.] We submit to the argument with-

out ill-nature, because we are satisfied that it is quite the other way.

Now, gentlemen, this subject of equality has been broached on the opposite side, by a very distinguished gentleman in the Democratic Party, a very eminent lawyer and a very close reasoner—I mean Mr. Charles O'Conor. He, in endeavoring to attract the attention, favor and support to the institution of Slavery from the people of the State of New York, put to them this proposition: "The condition of Slavery at the South is precisely, in the eye of the law, the condition of your sons here, while they are under age; the only difference between the lad of 20 at the North and the slave at the South being that the lad is to be emancipated at the age of 21, while the slave continues in the same condition for life." This monstrous proposition, gentlemen, is not for me to dissect or to refute. Its absurdity is obvious; but let me say to gentlemen, when they are using this reckless argument, that it is just as much an assertion of the equality of condition to say that the white man is on the same level with the black as it is to say that the black is on the same level with the white. There is no difference in that respect.

So you see, gentlemen, that none of these efforts to divert the public mind and the public attention from the real inquiry will avail anything. We are a political party. We act in our Federal relations within our political duty. We act upon the subject of Slavery within the Territories according to our notions of the safety and true development of our country.

WHAT THE "IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT" AMOUNTS TO.

Now, there being this conflict, let us see who it is between. The ordinary phrase for it is that it is between the North and the South Between the North and South? This "irrepressible conflict" but the occupation of the territory by these contending tides of population? Well, gentlemen, there is great danger in generalities. What is the North? What is the South? Where is the line drawn? The phrases have no meaning in our political constitution. There are no such powers. It answered very well in geographical description while the population of this country was confined to the margin of the Atlantic Ocean. But what has become of the division between the East and the West? We reach now from shore to shore of the two great oceans of the world. We have the great Mississippi Valley. We have a vast region of interior territory. Thence the division between the North and the South does not express the conflicting parties at all. Then they will say that it is between the Slave States and the Free States, but that is not so. If it were so, why then, under our system of politics, which gives the predominance of Federal votes the power of determining the question, it would have been settled long ago: there are 120 votes from the Slave States and 183 from the Free States, and it is very easy to see that a conflict dividing the parties of the country by that line, would be very soon ended.

No, gentlemen, these are cunning disguises by which this conflict is sought to be made geographical, or sought to be circumscribed on the one side or on the other by the demarcation of Sta e lines. It is not so. The controversy is between the friends and supporters of Slavery in the United States of America wherever they are, and the opponents of that institution who regard it as dangerous and injurious to the common benefit of the country. [Applause.] That is it. You cannot gain the credit of a great division of the country, or of great bodies of States. Look at it. I take it that in our midst Mr. O'Conor is as great an advocate, promoter and defender of the institution of Slavery as Mr. Yancey, who lives in Alabama. I take it that Mr. Cushing, of Massachusetts, is as vehement, as turbulent, as obstreperous an advocate of Slavery as Mr. Toombs, of Georgia. I take it that Gov. Seward is no more fiery or no more bold an opponent of the extension of Slavery than Cassius M. Clay, of Kentucky. [Applause.] I take it that Mr. Everett betrays the hopes of freedom by his timidity in the very citadel of Boston, and that Winter Davis beats down the proud pretensions of Slavery in the city of Baltimore. [Loud cheers.] Nay, St. Louis is to-day a more Republican city than New York; and Baltimore considering its position, is as bold at least as Boston. [Applause.] Now let us understand how we are grouped. So, too, there are large classes of our population—the slave traders of our Northern ports—the merchants who fit them out—their crews, and all the hangers on of that interest—the great share of the bankers, the great share of the moneyed interests of the northern States—these are combined with the interests of the slaveholders in the support and maintenance of Slavery. A great many of the farmers, a great many of the honest, plain, poor but hardy mechanics of Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina, Kentucy and Tennessee, are opponents of Slavery and Slavery extension, and they act and feel with the Republican party. [Applause.]

The division is of sentiment and of opinion and not of sections, or of States. [Loud applause.] Now, that being the division, you will perceive that whether or not one sentiment or the other can make headway, develop itself and find speech and act politically for the furtherance of it in one or the other part of the country, must depend upon the laws, upon the habits and upon the feelings of the people. Thus here, as I have stated, distinguished men advocate Slavery openly and fairly. Mr. O'Conor, to whom I have alluded, stated to a large New York audience that the question was, whether Slavery was just or not—that if Slavery was just, then they were right on their side—that if Slavery was unjust, then Gov. Seward and all his followers were right. He laid down the proposition to be enforced and accepted by us, that Slavery was just, benign and beneficent; that only those who were of that way of thinking should sustain the Democratic Party, and that all of the opposite opinion were rightfully on the Republican side. Mr. O'Conor is a clear-thinking, honest man, who utters his sentiments freely on these questions, and no one attempts to stop him from exercising his right of speech. But how is in the Southern States? Do they enforce their views in the general way of argument, suggestions, and fair and honest influence? There was an humble mechanic, a man of Irish origin, who went to the State of South Carolina to work as a bricklayer in the capital of that State—I mean Thomas Powers. He ventured a suggestion that Slavery was not "just," not "benign," not "beneficent"—an honest opinion,

doubtless, and one which he gathered from observation. What were the arguments that were used with him to satisfy him that he ought to change his opinion? Why he was taken—he was beaten with many stripes until the blood ran; he was tarred, he was feathered, he was starved, he was insulted, he was hooted from the community; and thus he was convinced, I suppose. [Laughter.] The stripes exhibited to him the manifest justice of Slavery, the boiling tar exhaling the ordor of its benignity, and the feathers descending in gentle mantle of its beneficence. [A Voice—"Hit him again."] Now, Mr. O'Conor and Mr. Powers, running in different lines of reason and argument would very likely come to opposite conclusions. [Applause and laughter.] No, gentlemen, our Constitution makes our suffrage free—leaves it to be settled by honest argument—by all the arts of fair and honest influence; and whenever the speech and the facts, the conduct and the character of the Republican Party can be made known in the communities that cherish and defend Slavery, you may rely upon it that there will be as many to uphold and defend free labor there as there are to defend and protect slave labor here. [Applause and cheers.]

THE PROMOTERS OF THE SLAVE TRADE.

Another very cutting sarcasm that we suffer from the voters of the States that have establishd and now maintain Slavery, to uphold their favorite institution, and from the Democratic orators, too, is, that we are a hypocritical race; that we are fond of money above every other thing, and trample, for gain-sake, our principles under our feet; that we fit out slave-traders; that our merchants furnish the means, the credit, and the insurance; and they say: "Look now at the North, which professes to be opposed to Slavery, and yet furnishes the means for this abominable traffic." Well, there is no fusion. It is not the North that is opposed to Slavery; it is the people, who have the sentiments of Freedom, who are opposed to Slavery; and those who have not those sentiments are engaged in anything, if you please, that the law will tolerate, or that the law will wink at, in advancement of Slavery. But let me ask that Democratic orator how many of those people that he thus classifies and stigmatizes, does he suppose vote the Republican ticket? [Laughtsr.] Whenever Republicans are caught in the service of Slavery we shall hang our heads! But when the orator who denounces our wickedness, counts among the voters of his party, captain and crew, the owner and merchant, the banker and district attorney, the officers and marshal, and the whole concern engaged in prosecuting, promoting, defending, protecting or winking at the abomination, it is for them to cease their accusations. [Applause.]

THE QUESTION OF THE TERRITORIES.

Now, gentlemen, after all, coming back to the Territories, the question is, are we planning, are we executing any oppression on our fellow-citizens of the Southern States by maintaining the rights of free labor, and our proposition that the Territories shall be occupied by free laborers, by free citizens from Georgia, from South Carolina, from Massachusetts, from New York, and where not? That depends, it is said, upon the Constitution of the United States of America; and the propositions of the different Platforms on this subject are put forth by the different parties to gain the adherence of the people. I will ask your attention first to the propositions of the different sections of the Democratic Party, and then to our own, saying first a word or two on the Platform of the Constitutional Union Party, which has given us no interpretation of the Constitution, and no views concerning it. It is a mistake to suppose that the Constitutional Union Party have confined themselves to declaring as their only sentiments, "The Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the Laws." They have gone further. They have said that it is the dictate of duty and patriotism to have no other sentiments at all. [Laughter.] None whatever can we have except what are embraced in the formula, "The Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the Laws." Well, "many men of many minds," and so long as Constitutions, Governments and Laws are open to construction and opinion, if you want us to know what your opinions are you must use some other phrase or terms than those which are common to us all—"The Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the Laws." [Applause.] We all go in for that. [Applause.]

Now, the Breckenridge Party say this:—

That the Government of a Territory organized by an act of Congress, is provisional and temporary; and during its existence all citizens of the United States have an equal right to settle with their property in the Territory, without their rights either of person or property being destroyed or impaired by Congressional or Territorial legislation.

That it is the duty of the Federal Government, in all its departments, to protect, when necessary, the rights of persons and property in the Territories, and wherever else its constitutional authority extends.

Now, gentlemen, you will notice that there was the same indisposition with the framers of these resolutions to mention the word "Slavery" that is known to have prevailed with the framers of the Federal Constitution. They determined that it should not be used, and for the best of reasons. The abhorrence of Slavery, the estimate of it as a temporary, exceptional foreign institution, made our fathers to sedulously omit from the whole framework of the Constitution the name of Slavery and slaves, and the fear of an intelligent free people led the framers of the Breckenridge Platform to leave out the word Slavery, and to prevent it from peeping out in any line or syllable. It was only by covering up the question under the abstract idea of the rights of property that they could get a hearing and secure anything but the merest indifference and contempt for their suggestion that the Constitution of the United States created, protected, defended or required from Congress the creation, the protection or defence of Slavery.

Well, now if you will take the Republican ideas about what is property under the Constitution, and what are persons under the Constitution, we will have no difficulty in saying that it is the duty of the Federal Government to protect the rights of persons and property in the Territories of the United States.

What is the Republican doctrine about protecting the right of property and persons in the Territories? The eighth section of the platform adopted at Chicago:—

"That the normal condition of all the Territory of the United States is that of Freedom; that as our Republican fathers, when they had abolished Slavery in all

our national territories, had ordained that 'No person should be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law,' it becomes our duty, by legislation, whenever such legislation is necessary, to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it; and we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, or of any individual, to give legal existence to Slavery in any Territory of the United States."

Now the Republican doctrine is that by the Constitution of the United States slaves are persons and are not property; that whenever they are named in that instrument they are so described as persons, and that in the spirit of our ancestors and in the records of their deliberations it is manifest everywhere that they would not admit into that Constitution even the word "servitude," much less "slavery," but only the word "service;" and the only stringent clause of the Constitution is that which looks to the rendition of escaped fugitives from service. But I do not hesitate to say that the Breckenridge proposition entirely fails in covering the institution of Slavery because they put themselves upon the general notion and name of property; and the Constitution of the United States nowhere, not in any line, not in any syllable, not by implication, not by possibility, stamps the character of chattel property upon men, to be protected, like bales of goods and hogsheads of sugar under the Federal jurisprudence as property. But if the Breckenridge proposition means to say that Congress and the Territorial Legislatures have no right to pass any laws impairing the rights either of person or property, in the general and extensive sense in which they use it, I do not hesitate to say it is the sheerest nonsense in the world. I should like to know what the whole function and duty, what the whole province, what the whole scope of enactments and of legislation are but the subjects of persons and property? I should like to know what there is in New York to legislate about if it is not persons and property? I should like to know if the Government that governs cannot legislate about persons and property? Now, to say that the Congress of the United States and the Territorial Governments they create have sole sovereignty over the Territory, and yet cannot legislate about persons and property, why, in the name of Heaven, what can they legislate about? You must either have a Government or no Government. If you have got a Government, it can govern. Why do they not put the language so that it will read that though it is a Government, and can legislate about persons and property, it cannot legislate about slaves? Why don't they say that slaves are neither persons nor property, but are mixed up of both—or take some other dogma, by which to make some magical exception of Slavery from the purview of legislation? It is a monstrous absurdity that a Government which rules a Territory does not include the dominion over slaves and their relations as well as white men and theirs—that the Government of a Territory which by its laws and their administration in the course of justice may have every white man within it, cannot by any enactments alter the condition of a slave for a single hour or to a hair's breadth ameliorate his condition.

SLAVERY SUBJECT TO THE CONTROL OF CONGRESS.

We have a Government or we have not a Government, and Slavery being a matter of positive law, is subject to the control of Congress. It is in these generalities where lurks the fraud that our opponents practice upon the intelligence of our people. The Douglas Platform is neither more nor less than this:—"Inasmuch as differences of opinion exist in the Democratic Party, as to the nature and extent of the powers of the Territorial Legislature, and as to the Powers of Congress, under the Constitution of the United States over the institution of Slavery within the Territories—*Resolved*, That the Democratic Parsy will abide the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on the questions of Constitutional law." [Laughter.]

Well, gentlemen, there is no objection to that. There is nothing Anti-Republican in that avowal. The Republican party not only leaves Slavery but all their rights about persons and property before the Supreme Court of the United States, when they come before that tribunal. So, you will see, that our friends have either not spoken explicitly, definitely and with frankness in the statement of their views, or else they have been unfortunate in the selection of a penman or the selection of words to express their meaning, for the Republican party accepts the United States Courts as the lawful expounders of their law in cases that come before them. And if Congress passes a law excluding Slavery from the Territories and a slaveholder takes his Slaves there; and if a Republican lawyer brings a writ of *habeas corpus*, and a Republican Judge says the Slave is free and you then go to the Circuit Court and the Republican Circuit Judge says also that the Slave is free; and if you then go the Supreme Court of the United States, and that Court says the law is unconstitutional and the Slave is not free, so long as the Government stands, so long as the judgment in that case stands, it shall be respected, as it was in the Dred Scott case, which made Dred Scott a Slave until he fortunately died. But on the other hand, if Congress passes a law that Slavery shall be established in the Territories, passes a Slave Code and a slave is there held, and a Republican lawyer brings a suit of *habeas corpus*, and a Democratic Judge in that Territory says the law is constitutional, and the Slave is a Slave, and a Democratic Circuit Judge, on an appeal, says the same thing, and the Supreme Court of the United States says that the law is unconstitutional and that the Slave is a free man, then let the people submit to the Supreme Court of the States. [Applause.] This idea of law and justice—reverence to law and justice being an element to bind the consciences of the good, and never an element strong enough to control the wicked passions of the bad—is a sentiment inconsistent with civil government and must be frowned upon every where. [Applause.]

When the Supreme Court of the United States makes this judgment in favor of liberty, then let it be obeyed. Now, gentlemen, how does it happen that the Supreme Court is such a favorite repository for the settlement of the questions of Liberty and Slavery? If you will notice, you will see that the Democratic Party, or the slaveholder's party, has shifted a good deal as to where it would trust this question. In the first place, Congress was the place to determine whether Slavery should or should not exist in the Territories. Large Democratic majorities, subservient Northern constituencies, unshamed-

faced Northern Representatives, made Congress a safe depository for the question of Slavery. But all at once the Republican sentiment found strength enough to express itself, and to control one branch of Congress, and then our Southern friends thought that Congress had no power over the question of Slavery in the Territories. [Laughter.] Not they! The people of the Territories had the power under the "great principle of Squatter Sovereignty"—the noble principle of the people controlling their own institutions, and Kansas was just the place to try it. Why did this principle suit Kansas? Why, because Kansas had a barrier of the Slave State of Missouri between it and freedom. The slave interest had free avenues to it for the overflowing dominion of Slavery, and they had violent men and violent passions, and wicked purposes, as power always has when it contends against right, and Squatter Sovereignty (not as Mr. Douglas now puts it, giving the sovereignty to the people when they are a grown-up community) meant, according to the pure Southern doctrine, that the first comers settled the question of Slavery or no Slavery, because Missouri could get there sooner than New York or Massachusetts. [Laughter.] That was all very well. But we are a free people, and we can move whether black men will carry us or not—[laughter and applause—]and though South Carolina and Missouri got there first, Massachusetts and New York stayed there the longest. [Prolonged applause and cheers.] When, behold the change in the views of the slaveholding party—"Was there ever such an abominable doctrine," they said, "as Squatter Sovereignty? It leads to all manner of violence and irritation between honest populations, turning them into voters and fighters, when they ought to be plowing and tilling the fields! How can American liberty stand the shock of Squatter Sovereignty?" [Laughter.] But we told you so, gentlemen—we told you that Congress was the place to fight it out in words, where you could vote and we could vote, and the sober, honest people, who sent us, were waiting for the decision. We ask them to take the matter back before Congress. "Take it back!—it is the unsafest and most unconstitutional place in the world! [Laughter.] If you attempt to pass a law in Congress to abolish Slavery in the Territories, we will dissolve the Union. The Supreme Court is the place."

SLAVERY AND THE SUPREME COURT.

Now, gentlemen, look at the unsleeping eye of Slavery—that great powerful interest which, while we, a free honest people, have been minding our own business, satisfying ourselves by sending John Jones or John Smith to Congress, has been seizing upon the power of the government; and the slave interest, with six millions of white people, and we with thirteen millions of white people—they have got the Supreme Court of the United States, and they have got the Circuit Courts, too. Yes, oddly enough, it turns out that six millions of men have five Judges, while thirteen millions have but four. That fact explains the safeness of the depository of the question of Slavery with the Supreme Court of the United States, and Douglas thinks, on the whole, that the Supreme Court of the United States is the best place to put it—for the present. [Laughter.] And, gentlemen, is not this an enormous fraud upon an honest people who suppose that everybody is as honest as themselves? Why, the circuit of one of the Supreme Court Judges—Judge McLean—contains four millions of white people; while one circuit presided over by a Supreme Court Judge in the Slave interest, and which contains within its jurisdiction the States of Mississippi and Arkansas, contains a population of 450,000 whites. A Northern Judge being made equal to the task of presiding over a circuit having five millions of active, enterprising white people, while to do the business of a quiet, peace-loving slave-owner's, one judge is required for less than a half million of whites. But, furthermore, whenever the organization of the Supreme Court shall be adjusted, according either to the claims, or the pressure of business, or the amount of population, there will be at least six of the nine judges representing the Free States, and three only representing the Slave States; then we will agree that the Supreme Court of the United States of America is the place to settle the question of Liberty and of Property. [Applause.]

It is a great mistake, gentlemen, to suppose that there is anything irreverent in calculating upon changes of opinion in the Courts of Justice. Lawyers have a prevalent notion that they change pretty often, and suitors sometimes find that whereas on a particular point the Court in one case decides against them, when three months after the case is again raised, and they are in opposite interest, it is decided against them too. And the Supreme Court of the United States—that venerable tribunal in regard to which neither by tone, by gesture, nor by implication will I ever raise my voice, let them be judges of the cases that come before them—let them decide them right or wrong—a free people must maintain their judiciary or they have no defence for their liberties. [Applause.] But some years ago it was the settled law of that Court—settled by the judgment of the great Chief Justice Marshall, and concurred in by his brother judges, that a corporation—a banking corporation if you please—could not be sued in a United States Court unless every stockholder was a citizen of one particular State That was the law year after year, and the Court decided in favor of one interest and against another in numerous instances upon that point. But a few years later the Court turned right around and said that the previous decision was all a mistake—and that the locality gave the jurisdiction of the Court without reference to the residence of the stockholders, and that a New York Bank could be sued in a New York District, although the stockholders might live partly in Massachusetts and partly in South Carolina. This, gentlemen, shows that differences of opinion may gain ground on subjects that come before the Courts; and when the great question on the meaning of the Constitution is argued before the Supreme Court of the United in reference to whether slaves are property under the jurisprudence of the United States, let us hope at least that a different judgment will be given, and that the Court will not hold that Slavery can be maintained in the State of New York under the sanction of the Federal Constitution. [Applause.]

OPINIONS LIABLE TO CHANGE.

Well, gentlemen, when opinions are all running one way it is very easy to say they will never change, but change is the law of politics

as well as in all else, and the people who think it so dangerous and so threatening to our liberties and to the Constitution of this country, should the Republican Party be trusted with the rule in the Federal Government, when they see it carried on by the Republican party even they may change their opinion. [Applause.] Changes quite as remarkable as that have occurred in subjects that are not connected with politics. We are all familiar now with the subject of rail roads and the speed and safety of trains of cars. But let me read to you what a grave reviewer said thirty-five years ago in the first English periodical—the London Quarterly. Satd he:—

"We are not advocates for visionary projects that interfere with useful establishments. We scout the idea of a rail road as impracticable. * * * What can be more palpably absurd and ridiculous than the prospects of locomotives traveling twice as fast as stage coaches? [Laughter.] We should as soon expect the people of Woolwich to suffer themselves to be fired off upon one of Congley's ricochet muskets, as to put themselves at the mercy of such a machine going at such a rate." [Loud laughter.]

Gen. Nye—That is conservatism.

Mr. Evarts: Now these conservative people who have all the while been riding in the slow coaches of a Pro-Slavery administration have been scouting the idea of anything so "visionary" as a Republican Government interfering with "useful establishments," (that is the Democratic party,) and they think it would be as mad as for the people of this country to be "fired off from one of Congreve's ricochet rockets" as for them to trust Lincoln and Seward with the conduct of this Government. [Laughter.] But they will live to travel fast and comfortably to the Pacific Rail Road march of free labor and free institutions. [Applause.]

THE REAL SECTIONALISM OF THE COUNTRY.

But, gentlemen, the real sectionalism of this country is the predominance of a particular interest that seeks its own aggrandisement at the expense and sacrifice of the common rights. Such, gentlemen, is the institution of Slavery—a State institution protected by laws—a property institution, as they call it, but an institution that for its own aggrandizement has striven to control, and has controlled, and will control while it may, the destinies of this country. Why, see how these orators from the South talk about the great staple, cotton. Mr. Yancey makes a speech to the merchants of New York on the subject of cotton. "Cotton," he says, "is a great production." Yes, he thinks "it is the mistress or the master of the world." Well, Mr. Yancey, that is all very fine; but whose cotton is that? Whose cotton?—why, the planters', of course. Yes, certainly it is. Each parcel of cotton that the planter raises, until he sells it, belongs to him; but as an item of production of national wealth and of national power, whose cotton is it, Mr. Yancey? Come, now, speak the truth? It is the cotton of the Nation to which we both belong. Yes, Mr. Yancey, it is. We tolerate none of these separations of interest. You cannot provoke an envy at the prosperity, at the growth, at the wealth of any of the States, or at the powerful influence as an element of national strength and national wealth of the great product cotton. [Applause.] So, when you set up that there is any such section as the South that owns cotton, or as the North that owns ships, understand that the locality of property is not to be confounded with the universality of national interest, and that our ships are yours and your cotton is ours. [Applause.]

The Republican Party favors no such disposition of separating the interests of the country. I fear that the slaveholding interest has allowed itself to be drawn into too much of this sentiment, and that it looks really with more complacency at the building up of Manchester, Liverpool, Havre and Paris by the productions of the South than it does upon the building up of Boston, Lowell, New York, or your own manufacturing towns. Let us have an end of this. Let us understand, then, the commercial question of this country, that, gifted with a domain that extends from ocean to ocean, inhabited by a people whose enterprise is baulked by no difficulties and runs into every peaceful avenue to development, formed by Providence with a hardy region that develops the man and the woman and the child who, in our part of the country, are able and willing to work with their hands and with their heads, having a vast grain-producing region in the valley of the Mississippi, and blessed by Providence with a monopoly, if you please, of the great staple for clothing the world, in your boasted cotton; all these are, by honest American industry, laid down as the rich tribute to the genius of the Constitution, to the strength of the Union, and to the enlargement of free and prosperous society. [Loud applause.] But when you turn around and talk about cotton being master of the freemen of the world; that the liberties of this country and the liberties of England hang, forsooth, upon a cotton thread; when you ask us to adopt the doctrine that, instead of new shirts being made for men to wear, that men were made to wear new shirts, that cotton dominates over the free spirit of commercial nations, you mistake your audience for the utterance of such ideas. [Applause.] Why, gentlemen, this Mr. Yancey would doubtless have us believe that the great Hercules of free labor that is to perform his twelve tasks of laying out this continent for the habitations of justice and freedom for generations unnumbered, yet to come, finds his final fate, as Hercules of old did in the shirt of Nessus, under whose debilitating poison he yielded up the vigor of his life. Mr. Yancey, this great cotton shirt of yours that you have wrapped around the world, may keep it warm, but it will never control the beatings of its heart. [Applause.]

SOUTHERN THREATS OF SECESSION.

Now, gentlemen, the present trouble with our friends in the Slave States is that when they come to complaining of difficulties and of apprehension, (and probably they feel them in some sort,) they do not seem to know what to propose, if anything, for us to do. They say if Lincoln is elected, though everything is done the Constitution says shall be done,—though he has the most votes, (and it is the duty of somebody to throw votes so as to elect somebody, if possible,) yet, after all this, if Lincoln is elected, they will secede from the Union! Why? Is it not constitutional? Yes, it is constitutional, but it threatens all kinds of mischief. Well, we ask, what have you say about it? Who, under Heaven shall we vote for? Down South you do not seem to be agreed upon this subject. You are voting

for Bell, you are voting for Douglas. Do you expect to elect either of them? No. We want to beat Lincoln! [Laughter.] Well, we might help you beat Lincoln, but whom shall we elect? Gentlemen, do you suppose that the public mind of the country is in a state to tolerate a discussion of this question, when there are votes enough to elect Lincoln, and not votes enough to elect anybody else. They will say, "We must have a President, and we must have Lincoln if we cannot have anybody else;" and our answer must be, until you show some concurrence of sentiment, how do we know but that, if we should help you to elect Douglas, you would not secede as you have threatened? And some of you say that Douglas is worse than Lincoln! Others of too, say that Breckenridge threatened the country; and still a part of you say that Bell is a traitor to Southern rights! What a bad lot of candidates there is before the people. Let us make haste and elect one of them, and hope for "better luck next time." [Laughter and applause.]

But this is Mexican politics—not ours—this saying that it is Constitutional to elect anybody who has the most votes, and if it turns out to be a man they like they will submit, but if it is a man they don't like they will not. Now here is our country—a great country, with a Constitution, a Union, prosperity, happiness, wealth, aggrandizement, power and fame. Are we to suffer these childish suggestions to interfere for a moment with our actions unless it be to offset it by a greater aggregate vote for the candidate upon whose election they would suggest a subversion of American liberty? Their principle is, that there is a power in this country that is stronger than the Constitution, and can subvert it and the laws, when we exercise our right of suffrage. If that be so, the sooner we find it out the better, and we will settle that matter in our turn, leaving as broad and firm and rich a legacy to our children as we received from our fathers.

Now, gentlemen, I shall detain you no longer, but with one suggestion shall leave this subject thus imperfectly treated, though I have trespassed much upon your patience. Lord Bacon says that "When you would have a tree produce more fruit than it is used to do, it is not anything that you can do to the boughs, but it is stirring the soil and putting fresh moulds about the roots that must work it." Now, our fathers planted this tree of constitutional liberty to flourish forever, to domineer with its protecting shade over this whole continent, from ocean to ocean, and be a shelter for generation after generation of men that should be true to the principles of liberty and true to the principles of justice. The winds of agitation may sweep in the boughs and the ordinary contrivances of party may keep up, if you please, the appearance of active intelligent care of the government; but I tell you that it has not produced as good fruit of late as it used to do. It is not anything that you do to the boughs, but it is stirring about the roots and extending the free soil from which they must derive nourishment that it is to reproduce and amplify forever and forever the growth, the beauty, the flower and the fruit which belong to its nature. [Loud applause and cheers.]

H281 83

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing Agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date:
JUL 1999
BOOKKEEPER
PRESERVATION TECHNOLOGIES, L.P.
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 003 258 231 A